

A
CRITICAL
HISTORY

Of the TEXT of the
New Testament;

WHEREIN

Is firmly Establish'd the Truth of those
Acts on which the Foundation of
CHRISTIAN RELIGION is laid.

By *Richard Simon*, Priest.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *R. Taylor*, MDCLXXXIX.



44
11. 20.
205

THE PREFACE.

THe Church, from the first and most early Ages of Christianity, has been constantly furnished with some Learned Men, by whose diligent care the Sacred Writings have been purged from those Faults, which by the tract of Time have insensibly crept into them. This kind of Labour, which requires an exact knowledge of Books, joyned with a strict enquiring into the Manuscripts, is termed Critical; in as much as it Judges and Determines the most Authentick Readings, which ought to be inserted into the Text. By this means Origen acquired his Reputation, not only in Greece, but universally over the Eastern part of the World, where the Bibles of his Correction are by the general consent preferred to all others.

St Jerom, who may justly be stiled the Latin Origen, has done very great Service to the Western Church, by his Critical Correction of the Latin Bibles, in Use in those Churches. Pope Damasus, very sensible of his profound Learning, obliged him to review the ancient Latin Version of the Gospels, which was then in a very miserable Condition. This look'd like too bold an Attempt, and seem'd above the force of any private Person, who could never hope to escape the Hatred of a multitude of Persons in the free exercising his Censure of Books, which had long stood in the peaceable Possession of an universal Reputation.

In short, though it might perhaps be for the benefit of the Church, it was yet a dangerous matter to attempt a Reformation of those ancient Errors, which derive their Authority from their Age. *Pius Labor, sed periculosa præsumptio* Hieron. *judicare de cæteris, ipsum ab omnibus judicandum, senis mutare linguam, & Præf. in cætescentem jam mundum ad initia retrahere parvulorum.* ['Tis a pious Work, Evang. (says that ancient Father) but very hazardous, that he exposes himself to the universal Censure, who reaches old Men to change their Language, and reduce the decaying World to a State of Infancy.] But considering on the one Hand the powerful Protection and Patronage of so great a Pope, and being on the other abundantly convinc'd of the manifest defect of that Translation, which had prevail'd universally in the West; he resolv'd rather to expose himself to the Malice of an infinite number of ignorant Persons, than fail in the discharge of his (a) Duty. He knew very well the charge of Innovation and Forgery, that would be

(a) *Quis enim doctus pariter vel indoctus, cum in manus volumen assumpserit, & à salivâ quam semel imbibit discrepare quod latitat, non statim erumpat in vocem, me falsarium, me clamitans esse sacrilegum, qui audeam aliquid in veteribus libris addere, mutare, corrigere?* Hieron. *Præf. in Evang. ad Dam.*

The Preface.

Hieron.
Epist. ad
Marcell.

drawn up against him for endeavouring to alter those ancient Books, which till his time had remained perfectly inviolable. But here he encouraged himself by the Precedents of Origen, Pierius, and some other able Critics, who had performed the very same thing in the Greek Original, which he then attempted in the Latin Copies of the Gospel. For which reason he stoutly deposed all those which after his Reformation remained Bigots to the ancient Latine Version. *Revertimur ad nostros bipedes asellos, & illorum in aure buccinâ magis quàm ci-tharâ concupimus. Illi legant, spe gaudentes, tempori-servientes: nos legamus, spe gaudentes, Domino servientes.*

But time did Justice to that Father. And 'tis a very difficult matter at present, to find any Copies of that Latine Version, which was then in Use in the Western Church. Yet enough there are extant to be read as a Memorial to convince those, who defend Errors meerly out of Veneration for their Antiquity, that St. Jerome has done the Church no small Service, in Correcting and Reviewing the ancient Latine Copies, according to the strictest Rules of Criticism. This we endeavour to demonstrate in this work, and that the most ancient Greek Exemplars of the New Testament are not the best, since they are suited to those Latine Copies, which St. Jerome found so degenerate as to need an Alteration.

Father Morin, and after him Father Amelot, who take such pride in those Noble and Venerable Manuscripts, on account of their great Antiquity, never mind, that a thousand or twelve hundred years can never warrant them correct, since there is evident proof of their Corruption before that time. It was necessary that I should examine to the bottom, the Circumstances of these Greek Texts, which have been produced to this Time. It is not sufficient to consult those Manuscripts with design only to mark their Antiquity, and quote the different Readings. There is required a great deal of Discretion and Judgment, otherwise we shall mistake those Books which are altered, for Primitive and Apostolical Exemplars, which is the Case of the two Authors we are about to name.

Erasmus, who was well enough furnished with those sorts of Manuscripts, is nevertheless guilty of very gross Errors. He accuses the Greeks without reason, for correcting in some places, their Copies by those of the Latin, after their Re-union with the Roman Church. This groundless Accusation can proceed from nothing, but the want of knowledge of the Criticisms of those Copies, which he consulted.

Beza, who was Master of a greater Collection of Manuscripts of the New Testament than Erasmus, though assisted too by both Robert and Henry Stephens, has not well distinguished the worth of his Manuscript Copies, whence I found my self in some places obliged to correct his Errors. This Man was so prejudiced by his Religion, as to accuse the Italians of Corrupting the old Text, and forcing it to a Compliance with their Opinions.

This Critical History contains divers other Remarks of the like Nature, upon the Manuscript Copies of the New Testament, both in Greek and Latine. My principal aim is to write a Supplement to the Defects of those who compile the different Readings out of the Manuscripts, without distinguishing the Good from the Bad. To which intent, it is necessary to read a great quantity, and nearly examine them in a Critical manner. This Art, whose difficulty appears formidable to some Divines in this Age, made part of their Occupation of some Ladies in St. Jerome's time: Who not content to read the Scripture in the Vulgar Tongue, dispersed among the People, they diligently enquired after the correctest Copies, learning those very Tongues in which they were writ.

I assert

The Preface.

I assert nothing, which cannot be maintained by the Letters of those Pious Ladies, and the answers of that Learned Father, who has had oftentimes a difficult Task to satisfy those Questions they propose on matters purely Critical. *St. Jerome* had advanced, that the Apostles had never cited any Passage in the Old Testament, which did not perfectly agree with the Hebrew Text. *Eustochium*, *Hieron.* who perfectly understood the Greek and Hebrew Languages, opposed him with *Procm.* such powerful Arguments, that he was forced to own himself almost overcome with the strength of her *Objections.* *Quod cum audissem, quasi à fortissimo pugile percussus essem cœpi tacitus æstare.* in lib. 16. Comm. in Isai.

It is no strange thing to find those Ages, when Barbarism reigned over all Europe, neglect Critical Studies. Then they wanted abundance of those helps, which they now enjoy to pursue those Studies, which are absolutely necessary to a perfect Knowledge of Divinity. But that which amazes me, is, that in this very Age, this Art should still remain in contempt; and those Men be thought no more than Grammarians; who apply themselves to it. Besides, we cannot but see the manifest Errors of some Divines in this Age, who know not the true Laws of Criticism.

It is worth observing, that the ancient Hereticks have been perpetually accused of having corrupted the Books of the New Testament, and perverted them to their own sense. That has often been thought a wilful and designed Corruption, which proceeded only from the fault of the Transcribers, or difference of Copies. The Ecclesiastical Writers of the first Ages have not done that strict Justice to the Hereticks of their times, in relation to the New Testament, that they have given the Jews in the Disputes about the different manners of explaining the Old Testament. Those pretended Corruptions presently vanish upon Examination of the ancient Manuscripts, and the Original of the various Readings. Wherefore in this Piece I have justified the *Arrians*, *Nestorians*, and the rest of the Sectaries from that Imputation of having falsified the Originals of the Evangelists and Apostles, to maintain their Innovations. We have also plainly evinced, by some considerable Examples, that the most Learned Criticks of our Age are not exempted from those Prejudices in their declaring too freely those Hereticks falsifiers of the Text.

The case of some other Sectaries is not the same, who declared themselves openly against the Writings of Christ's Disciples, which they have corrected and altered according to their own Ideas of the Christian Religion. Some daring to forge Supposititious Gospels, and Acts, the better to give authority to their Foppies. It would be very pertinent, for the better Distinction of all the Genuine Pieces of the New Testament, to make a Collection of those ancient Acts, and diligently examine them. Wherefore we have not concealed any of those Arguments which those Hereticks, or the other Enemies of Christianity have brought to destroy the Truth of those Books, which were received by all the Catholic Churches.

But as it would be a pernicious thing to expose these ill things, without administering Remedies so proper for the cure, we have also produced the strongest Reasons which the Ecclesiastical Writers have brought against them. We intreat the Protestants to make Reflection on these matters, and observe those methods of the first Ages of the Church, for establishing the Authority of the Sacred Writings. They will find nothing impertinent in the Conduct. *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and the rest of the Defenders of those Writings, did not object to the Enemies of the Christian Religion, their private Spirit, which persuaded them of the Divinity of the Holy Scripture, but very substantial Reasons, void of all such Fanaticism. Tho they were sufficiently persuaded of the Divinity of the Holy Scripture, they

The Preface.

they never objected to the Adversaries, that it had impress upon it such lively Characters of its Original, that it was a very difficult matter not to acknowledge it, when read with a Spirit of Submission and Humility. Their Adversaries being Philosophers who consulted their natural Reason, they opposed them from sure and indisputable Principles.

Again, I thought in a Work of this nature not convenient to suppress the principal Objections of the Jews against the Books of the New Testament: For although this miserable Nation is an Object of the contempt of the whole World, yet has there appeared among them Men of great Address and Subtily in the Disputes against the Christians, which I have often found true in my own Experience, when I have endeavoured to convince them by their own Principles. Since their Plea for Prescription is better, and their Pretensions are that the Disciples of Jesus the Son of Mary, had no reason to change their Religion which was delivered them by the Fathers. It is but necessary to examin what they object against the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles.

In this Critical History I have treated divers other important Questions: And where I deviate from the Methods of the Divines of the School, it is because I have found a more secure way. I have employed all my strength to avoid the advancing any thing that is not grounded on authentic Records, instead of which the School-Divinity teaches us, to doubt of the most certain. Our Religion consisting principally in Matters of Fact, the Subtleties of Divines, who are not acquainted with Antiquity, can never discover certainty of such matters of Fact: They rather serve to confound the Understanding, and form pernicious Difficulties against the Mysteries of our Religion.

Let it not seem strange to any Person, that I recede from the Opinions which are generally received in the Schools, and prefer to the Sentiments of whole Universities the new Opinions of some modern Divines, which can hardly be taxed as novel, when they are found conformable to the Ancient Doctors of the Church. This I speak in reference to that Passage, where I handle the Dispute which was formerly between the Divines of Louvain and Doway, and the Jesuits of that Country, concerning the inspiration of the sacred Books. The Doctors of both Faculties censured the Propositions of the Jesuites of Louvain in a manner very injurious to the whole Society. But after a due examination of the Reasons on which their grave Gentlemen founded their Censure, I could hardly believe their Authority alone a sufficient Rule to oblige me to assent.

I propose Truth alone to my self in this Work, without any Deference to any Master in particular. A true Christian who professes to believe the Catholick Faith, ought not to stile himself a Disciple of S. Austin, S. Jerome, or any other particular Father, since his Faith is founded on the word of Jesus Christ contained in the Writings of the Apostles, and constant Tradition of the Catholick Churches. I wish to God the Divines of the Age were all of that opinion, we then should not have seen so many useless Disputes, which only prove the causes of Disorders in Church and State. I have no private Interest which obliges me to any Party, the very name of Party is odious to me; I solemnly protest, I have no other intentions in composing this Work, than the benefit of the Church, and the establishing the most sacred and divine thing in the World.

It is useless to repeat here what we said in another place concerning the word Critick, which is a term of Art, which in some sense is bestowed on all Works whose designs are to examin the various readings, and establish the true. The

The Preface.

aim of those which practise that Art, is not to destroy, but establish. As the Holy Books are not exempt from faults, which either by the tract of Time, or negligence of the Transcribers have slipped into 'em; some Learned Persons in all Ages have taken care to render them correct. The most barbarous Ages have produced Books, which they call, *Correctoria Biblicæ*, or *Corrections of the Bible*. The Emperor Constantine, spared nothing to procure for the Oriental Churches correct Copies of all the Bibles. Charlemagne and his Successors have done the same for the Latine Bibles of the Western Churches.

Besides those which were formerly employed in the Monasteries about Transcribing of Books: There were some Criticks who reviewed and corrected them. This is the Reason why in some Manuscript ancient Bibles, there are some Corrections found of equal Antiquity with the Books themselves. But without ascending so far to have a Precedent for the Use of Critical Reflections on the Sacred Books, we need only consider the Transactions of the Latter Age, relating to the Latine Editions of our Bibles: What prodigious pains was Robert Stephens at, according to the Relation of Hentenius a Divine of Louvain, to give us an exact and correct Edition of the Bible? This Divine which laboured after Stephens in the same matter, admires the diligence and excessive expence of that Printer, to whom he ingeniously acknowledges himself indebted. *Nemo est, qui nesciat, ut unum pro multis in medium adferam, quantam diligentiam, quantasque impensas tulerit Robertus Stephanus Regius apud Lutetiam Typographus, quem honoris causa nominino, ut accuratissima & castigatissima nobis Biblia traderet, propter quod plurimum etiam illi debent quotquot Sacrarum Literarum lectioni sunt addicti, quem ob id etiam in multis secuti sumus.*

The Doctors of the Faculty of Divinity of Louvain, perfected afterwards the Edition of their Brother, with a greater Collection of Manuscripts, and re-altered some places according to the Rules of Criticism, which they thought not corrected with exactness enough. Nicolas Zegers, a Religious Man of the Order of St. Francis, apply'd himself entirely to the Correction of the Books of the New Testament. He dedicated his Critique to Julian III. under the Title of * *Corrections on the New Testament, wherein is re-established what was corrupted, expunged what was added, and added what was before expunged.* He assures that Pope in his Epistle Dedicatory, (b) That he had freed from an infinite number of Faules and false Glosses the ancient Latine Version, which had been in Use among the Western Churches, from the very Times of the Apostles.

There is nothing more exactly † performed than the Critical Remarks of Lucas Brugensis in his Edition of the Latine Bible of the Divines of Louvain. Among the multitude of his Copies, he mentions one which was corrected by some Dominicans on the Bibles of Charlemagne. He sets some marks of Esteem on another Manuscript, entitled, *The Correction of the Bible.* Præter alia, id quod maximi facimus Manuscriptum Bibliorum correctorium ab incerto auctore magnâ diligentia ac fide contextum. ‡ And he assures us, (c) that the different Readings,

(b) Hæc est genuina, germana & emendata veteris nostri Interpretis versio seu translatio, quâ hæcenus semper à tempore ferè Apostolorum, aut non ita diu post, usq. cognoscitur Romana Ecclesia, quam ab innumeris tum mendis, tum adulterinis adjectionibus, non sine magnis & multis molestiis repurgavimus. Zeger. Epist. ad Jul. III.

(c) Quæ à nostri seculi scriptoribus ex manuscriptis codicibus collectæ sunt variae lectiones, omnes propemodum in eo comperimus, & ad fontes fideliter in- examinatos deprehendimus. Luc. Brug. Notar. in Gen. c. 8. v. 7.

Joann. Henten. Præf. in Bibl. Lovan. ann. 1547.

* Castigationes in Novum Testamentum, in quibus depravata restituntur, adjecta reserantur, & sublati adjiciuntur.

Autore Tac. Nicolao Zeger. Colon. ann. 1555.

† Notationes in Sacra Biblia, quibus variantia discrepantibus exemplaribus loca summo studio discuti-

‡ Luc.

Brug. Gen. c. 8.

quibz v. 7.

The Preface.

which have been observed by the Critics of the latter Times, are all found in this Book, where they are examined according to the Hebrew Text.

I have elsewhere mentioned another Manuscript of like nature, which is in the ancient Library of the Colledge of Sorbon. I have likewise given Extracts out of it, which manifestly prove that the Latins have not neglected the Critical Study of the Sacred Books, in those very Ages when Barbarism reigned in Europe.

It is a Vanity in the admirers of the Hebrew Text of the Jews, to bestow such great praises on the Massoreth, a good part of which consists in Trifles or superstitious Observations. The Christians of both the Eastern and Western Churches, with more Judgment, have taken care in the Correction of the Bibles, as manifestly will appear by this Work. We ought to prefer to the Massoreth those learned

* Roma-
ni Corre-
ctores.

* Critics of Rome, which by the order of Pope Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. corrected the Latine Bibles, which Correction serves instead of an exact Massoreth to the Western Church. There are none but Protestants of ill minds, such as Thomas James, Author of the Bellum Papale, who cavil at the differences of the Editions of the Bible published by those two Popes. There may indeed be a more perfect work, but that ought to be reserved for particular Notes, which no ways diminish the Authority of those Books received into publick Use.

I must only add two words concerning those Aids which are made use of in this Work. For the Manuscripts, I mark the Libraries where they are found, I have cited none without reading them; the Extracts being all done by my self, except that of Cambridge, which contains the four Gospels, and the Aids of the Apostles. I had procured out of England a faithful Copy of this last Manuscript in what relates to the Greek, which I have exactly followed.

As for the Printed Books, of which there are numerous Quotations, for the most part I have contented my self to relate the Passages in short following the sense only, in the Body of the work. For long Citations of Passages where there are but five or six words, perhaps, pertinent to the Occasion, must needs prove very tiresome. This is the very same Method which I have followed in the Critical History of the Old Testament. But some Persons desiring such Passages at length, to avoid searching them in the Books, to comply with their Desires, and keep to our Method; we judged it convenient to put them at large at the bottom of the Page in the proper Languages of the respective Authors.

A CRI-

A
CRITICAL HISTORY

Of the TEXT of the

New Testament,

Wherein is establish'd

The Truth of those A C T S on which
CHRISTIANITY is founded.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

*The Verity of the New Testament defended in general
against the ancient Hereticks. Reflections upon the
Principle made use of by the Fathers to establish the
Authority of these Books.*

JESUS Christ having profess'd that he came not into the World Matth. 17.
to destroy the Old Law, but rather to accomplish it, it seem-
ed not to him necessary to publish his Doctrine in Writing.
He was content to prove his Mission by his Miracles, and
to support his Reformation upon the Books of the Old Testament
which were received by all the Jews, to whom the Messias had
been promised. So that we do not find him to have given order

B

to

Mar. xvi.
15,

to his Disciples to put any thing into Writing. He only commands them to Preach his Gospel to all the Nations of the Earth; *Go ye, says he to them, into all the world, and preach the Gospel.* The Books of the New Testament took their Original from this preaching. This it was that caused *Tertullian* to say, (a) That the Apostles, to whom Jesus Christ had given this Command to promulge the Gospel, were the Authors thereof. Upon the whole matter, the Gospels had not been put in Writing but at the request of those People who were willing to preserve the memory of that which the Apostles had preached to them. *S. Paul* composed the greater part of his Epistles for the Instruction of Churches which were already erected. That History which we call the *Acts of the Apostles* was published to no other end but to shew to the Faithful the Progress of the Christian Religion upon its first advance into the World: and the Christians not having at that time any State separate from that of the Jews, and being present and assisting at all their Ceremonies in the Temple and in the Synagogues, they had no Persons appointed to record any thing of importance which pass'd among them. And this is the reason that we find not here, as in the Old Testament, any publick Writers who had the Charge of collecting the Acts of their State. This, during the Primitive times of Christianity, gave a pretence to several Hereticks to doubt of the truth of those Apostolical Books which to them seem'd to want some publick Attestation. *S. Ignatius*, in one of his Epistles, complains, (b) That he understood there were some men who said they could not believe the Gospel, except they could find it written in the * *Archives*. The holy Martyr answers them, That it was written, that the Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, and a Faith in him, were instead of the most authentick *Archives*. It was then difficult to distinguish the Books which had been composed by the Apostles, or by their Disciples, from those which had been forged by false Apostles or by some Sectaries. Every one bore in its front either the Name of the Apostles in general, or of some single one of their number: and since there were no publick *Archives*, to which recourse might be had for the deciding and clearing of matters of this nature, the Hereticks took occasion from thence

* There
are some
who read
ἀρχαίους,
Ancients.

(a) *Constitutum in primis Evangelicum instrumentum Apostolos autores habere, quibus hoc munus Evangelii promulgandi ab ipso Domino sit impositum.* Tertul. l. 4. adv. Marcion. c. 2.

(b) Ἦκουσιν πῶς λεγόντων, ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἔσται, οὐκ ἐστὶν εὐαγγέλιον. Ignat. Ep. ad Philad.

to publish a great number of false Acts; of which hardly any thing is left to Posterity except the Titles of them and a few Fragments.

These Sectaries boasted that they taught the Doctrine of the Apostles, or at least of their Disciples. *Basilides*, who was one of the most ancient Hereticks, avouched that he had for his Master, (c) *Glaucias*, one of St. Peter's Interpreters. *Valentin* affirmed with the same boldness, that he had been instructed in Religion by *Theodad*, (d) who was one of St. Paul's familiar Acquaintance. But whereas they did not agree amongst themselves, and on the contrary the Doctrine of the Apostles was perfectly uniform in the Churches that they had planted; the Fathers made use of this Uniformity of Doctrine to confirm and establish the truth of the Apostolical Writings. *Clement Alexandrinus* answers *Basilides* and *Valentin*, that there was but one true ancient Church, that was before all Heresies. From thence he brings an unquestionable proof of the falsity of the Doctrine of these Sectaries, who durst be so bold as to give the Name of * the Doctrine of the Apostles to their own Inventions: he represents to them, that (e) the Doctrine of the Apostles were one, as well as their Tradition. The Primitive Christians argued against the Hereticks of those times, from Tradition, and from the Conformity of that Belief that was manifest in all the Churches founded by the Apostles; as may be seen at large in the Works of St. *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, *Epiphanius*, and St. *Augustin*, and in a word, of all the Fathers that have defended the Writings of the Apostles against the Hereticks. Whensoever any Sectary opposed the declared Gospel, they immediately convinced him of the forgery of those Acts that he produced, by the true ones that were kept in the Apostolical Churches, and were instead of *Archives*. (f) If any one, saith St. *Epiphanius*, should go about to counterfeit the Edicts or Ordinances of Emperors, the Cheat would be soon laid open, by producing the true Copies taken from the *Archives* of the Court; In like manner, adds he, false Gospels composed by Hereticks may be detected; their spurioufness may be easily discovered, by

* διδομεν
αὐτῶν τὴν
δοκίμην.

(c) Γλαυκίαν τὸν Πέτρου ἑρμηνεῖα. Apud Clem. Alex. lib. 7. Strom.

(d) Γνωστὸν Παύλου. Apud Clem. Alex. ibid.

(e) Μία ἡ πάντων γέγονε ἡ ἀποστόλων ὡς καὶ διδασκαλία, ὅπως ὃ καὶ ἡ δοκίμοις. Clem. Alex. ibid.

(f) "Ὅταν βασιλεὺς ἡγεμονὶ πνεύματος βασιλικὴν ἀρχὴν ἔσται, καὶ τὸν ἀρχὸν τὰ ἀντί-
θετα ἀντιπαραστήσει καὶ ἀντιπαραστήσει τὸν ἀρχὸν, ὅπως καὶ τὸν βα-
σιλικὸν ἔχει, τοῦτο τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἀντιπαραστήσει τὸν ἀρχὸν ἑλπίσει
τὸν ἀρχὸν καὶ τὸν ἀρχὸν ἐλπίσει. Epiph. Hæc. 42.

producing the true Gospels, that are kept in the Churches as it were in *Archives*.

This manner of defending the Truth of the Apostolical Writings against the ancient Sectaries, hath proved so effectually convincing, that the *Gnosticks* were obliged to support their Novelties, to fly to I know not what secret Tradition that was known to none but themselves. They were so insolent as to prefer themselves before the Apostles and Disciples of Jesus Christ, accusing them as not having preached the Purity of the Gospel with sincerity, because, say they, they have retained many Ceremonies of the old Law. They thought by this means, that they might be able with Authority to reform the Writings of the Apostles. (g) There is no way (saith St *Irenæus*) of convincing this sort of People, neither by the Testimony of the Scriptures generally received in the Churches planted by the Apostles, nor by authentick Traditions, because they imagine themselves to be above all this. They were persuaded, that they alone were in possession of the truth of Religion that contained hidden Mysteries: *Se indubitatè & incontaminatè & sincerè absconditum scire mysterium*. And since they had joined Philosophy with Christianity, they intended also to accommodate the one to the other. They argued on matters of fact after a pure metaphysical manner; and being filled with an infinite number of Prejudices and Notions taken from the Principles of their Philosophy, they reformed the Doctrine of the Apostles, and even that of Jesus Christ on this foundation, under pretence of bringing Religion to a greater Perfection. They pretended that the Apostles had preached the Gospel before they had a perfect knowledge of the Truth, and that therefore they were at liberty to correct them: *Ante prædicaverunt, quàm perfectam haberent cognitionem*. This was that which caused them to take the ambitious Title of Learned and Knowing Men, or *Gnosticks*, as if none but they were endued with the true knowledge of Religion. They vainly boasted also that they had reformed the Apostles: *Gloriantes emendatores se esse Apostolorum*. S. *Irenæus* sharply reproves their rashness in bragging that they had made perfect that which was gross and obscure in the Gospel published by the Apostles.

It hath been necessary to make all these Reflections on the an-

(g) *Cum autem ad eam iterum traditionem quæ est ab Apostolis, quæ per successiones Presbyterorum in Ecclesiis custoditur, provocamus eos, adversantur traditioni dicentes, se non solum Presbyteris, sed etiam Apostolis existentes superiores sinceram invenisse veritatem; Apostolos autem admiscuisse ea quæ sunt legalia Salvatoris verbis. Iren. lib. 3. adversus Hær. c. 2.*

cient.

cient Sect of the *Gnosticks*, because they have applyed themselves more than any others in those primitive times of the Christian Religion, to the obtruding of false Acts under the Names of the Apostles, or other specious Titles. These are a sort of Philosophers that ought not to pass but for half Christians, who have altered the Traditions that the Disciples of Jesus Christ had left to the Churches. And therefore no regard ought to be had to all the Books that they have produced under what Name soever, since they have professed that they understand Religion better than the Apostles themselves, and (b) have been so bold as to publish new Gospels, to which they have given the Title of *The Gospel of Truth*, altho these Gospels do not agree with those of the Apostles. This alone is sufficient to make it appear, that the Gospels of the *Gnosticks* were false Acts, that cannot be opposed to the Apostolical Writings that have been acknowledged by the primitive Churches.

It were an easie matter to answer *Celsus* by this same Principle, who heretofore objected to the Christians, that they changed their Gospel every day, adding thereto, and diminishing what they thought fit, that they might be able by this means to retract that which they had formerly alledged. *Origen* judiciously answers this Philosopher, who was a great Enemy to the Christian Religion, that he unhappily confounded the ancient Sectaries with the true Faithful: He protests, that he knows not in the least, that the Gospel hath been corrupted by others than the *Gnosticks* or *Marcion*: (i) This is not a Crime (saith he) that ought to be imputed to the Gospel, but to them that have dared to corrupt it. He brings an Example of the Sophisters, whose false Doctrine cannot be attributed to true Philosophy. (k) It is the same thing (saith this great Man) with respect to the Sects that have introduced Novelties into the Doctrine of Jesus Christ, which cannot be charged on true Christianity. It is certain, that in all times; and in all places there hath been a perfect Conformity between the different Copies of these Books; the Diversities that are found

(h) *Existentes extra omnem timorem suas conscriptiones preferentes, plura habere gloriantur quam sint ipsa Evangelia. Si quidem in tantum processerunt audacia, uti quod ab his (Apostolis) non olim conscriptum est veritatis Evangelium titulent, in nihilo conveniens Apostolorum Evangeliiis, ut nec Evangelium quidem sit apud eos sine blasphemia.* Iren. adv. Her. lib. 3. c. 11.

(i) *Τὸ τὸ λαβόντων ἢ τὸ λόγῳ εἶναι ἔγκλημα, ἀλλὰ τολμῶντων παροτρύνειν τὰ εὐαγγέλια.* Orig. lib. 2. contra Celi.

(k) *Οὐτως ἢ τὸ ἀλλοτρίῳ χειρταγμένῳ ἔγκλημα δι' ἡμετέρας ἀπορίας τὰ εὐαγγέλια, ἢ αἰρέσει ἑνῶς ἐκπορεύεσθαι τῆς βουλῆς τῆς Ἰησοῦ διδασκαλίας.* Orig. 10. d.

therein, and shall be remarked in the Sequel of this Work, are not of so great moment, as that we may say with *Celsus*, that the Christians have changed their Gospels, to the end that they might suit them to their own opinions. This cannot be understood but of the ancient Hereticks, who having no certain Rules for their Belief, reformed them according to their capricious humor. This is that for which the Orthodox Christians heretofore censured the *Theodosians*, who corrupted the Sacred Books under a pretence of correcting them; and whereas several among them had taken this liberty, all their Copies differed one from another: there were of them under the Names of *Aesclepiades*, *Theodosius*, *Hermophilus* and *Apollonius*, that did not in the least agree together.

*Euseb. l. 5.
Hist. Eccl.
c. 28.*

I will say nothing here concerning the Gospel of the *Marcionites* whereof *Origen* makes mention, because I design to treat of it in another place: I shall only add, that if we compare the Gospels and the other Books of the New Testament with the Liturgies that we have under the Names of several Apostles, to whom the most part of the Eastern Christians do attribute them, we shall be convinced that the Gospels are truly of the Apostles. For all the Churches have preserved them in their ancient Purity; whereas every particular Nation hath added to their Liturgies, and hath taken the liberty often to revise them. The respect that hath been always had to the Writings of the New Testament, without inserting any considerable Additions therein, is an evident proof, that all People have looked upon them as Divine Books, which it is not lawful for any to alter. On the contrary they have been persuaded, that the Liturgies, altho they bear the Names of the Apostles, or of some Disciples of Jesus Christ, were not originally written by them to whom they were attributed. And therefore it hath been left free to the Churches to add to them, or to diminish from them, according as occasion requires.

The Principles that have been maintained above in discoursing of the *Gnosticks*, may serve to confute the *Manicheans*, who likewise acknowledge nothing Divine in the Scriptures but that which pleased them, or rather was agreeable to their Fancies. This caused *S. Austin* to say, addressing himself to *Faustus*, who was one of the chief of this Party, (1) *You are then the Rule of Truth, whatsoever is against you is not true.* He clearly demonstrates to them, that they were only upheld with false prejudices, when they

(1) *Tu es ergo regula veritatis. Quidquid contra te fuerit non est verum.*
Aug. lib. 11. cont. Faust. c. 2.

rejected the Writings of the Apostles against the Authority of all the Churches of the World, and at the same time received the Apocryphal Books that had no Authority. If any one (continues this Father) should oppose you, and should make use of your own words, that that which you alledge on your behalf is false; and on the contrary that which is against you is true, (m) what would you do? How could you defend the truth of those Acts that you produce? How could you prove their Antiquity, not having any Witnesses in Tradition by whose Testimony they might be confirmed? From whence he concludes (n) that it is absolutely necessary on this occasion to have recourse to the Authority of those Churches that were established ever since the primitive times of the Christian Religion, and to the consent of Nations that have received the Books of the New Testament from the Apostles.

He observes further, and more close to the purpose; that if it were only disputed concerning the variety of Copies, since they are but few in number, it would be sufficient to consult the Copies of different Countries; and if they did not agree in this point, the greater number should be preferred before the lesser, or the more ancient before the later: *Plures paucioribus, aut vetustiores recentioribus preferrentur*. But the Manicheans, who judged not of the Truth of these Books but with relation to their own Ideas, refused to submit to this Authority; they consulted only their reason in matters of Fact, wherein all Deference ought to be given to Authority; therefore when any passage was urged to them that thwarted their Opinion, they boldly affirmed that that part had been corrupted, or that the Book wherein it was found had been composed by some Impostor under the name of the Apostles. Faustus, for example, who avouched, that after having diligently perused the Books of Moses, he could not find therein any Prophecy that had any regard to Jesus Christ, takes this method in answering the Texts of the New Testament. Where express mention is made of these Prophecies, Jesus Christ saith in speaking of himself, *Moses hath wrote of me*; Faustus answers to this, that after a serious examination of this passage, (o) his reason obliged

Joann. v. 46.

(m) *Quid ages? Quò te convertes? Quam libri à te prolati originem, quam vetustatem, quam seriem successionis testem citabis?* Aug. ibid.

(n) *Vides in hac re quid Ecclesia Catholica valeat auctoritas, quæ ab ipsis fundatissimis sedibus Apostolorum usque ad hodiernum diem succedentium sibimet Episcoporum serie & tot populorum consensione firmatur.* Aug. ibid.

(o) *Ratione cogebar in alterum è duobus, ut aut falsum pronunciarem capitulum hoc, aut mendacem Jesum: sed id quidem alienum pietatis erat Deum existimare mentitum. Rectius ergo visum est scriptoribus adscribere falsitatem, quam veritatis auctoritati mendacium.* Apud Aug. lib. 16. contra Faust. c. 2.

him

Matth. v.
17.

him to conclude, either that it was false, or that Jesus Christ had not spoken the truth; and since it would be no less than impious Blasphemy to say that God could lie, it would be more advisable to attribute the falsification to the Writers themselves. When it was demanded of this Heretick why he did not receive the Old Law, and the Prophets whom Jesus Christ himself hath authorised in the New Testament, by his words, *I am not come to destroy the Law or the Prophets, but to fulfil them*: he objected against the Testimony of S. Matthew, because he is the only Evangelist that hath related this. It is supposed (saith he) that this Discourse was delivered in the Sermon that Jesus Christ made on the Mountain. In the mean time S. John (p) who was there present speaks not a word thereof; and yet they would have S. Matthew, who saw nothing, to mention it. He pretends that this hath been wrote by some other person, and not by S. Matthew.

After this manner the *Manicheans* who sacrificed all to their Reason, and almost nothing to Authority, entirely destroyed the Books of the New Testament, receiving them no farther than they were conformable to their Prejudices: they had formed to themselves a certain Idea of Christianity, after which they regulated the Writings of the Apostles. They would have it that all that which could not be adjusted to this Idea had been inserted in their Books by later Writers who were half Jews: *Fauftus* saith,

Apud Aug. l. 33. cont. Faust. c. 3. Multa enim a majoribus vestris eloquiis Domini nostri inserta verba sunt, quæ nomine signata ipsius cum fide non congruant; præsertim quia, ut jam sæpe probatum a nobis est, nec ab ipso hæc sunt, nec ab ejus Apostolis scripta; sed multa post eorum assumptionem a nescio quibus, & ipsis inter se non concordantibus Semi-Judæis, per famas opinionisque comperta sunt, &c.

But S. Augustin represents to them in this very same passage, that one must renounce common sense to argue after this manner on matters of Fact, to which imaginary reasons ought not to be opposed. (q) We cannot be certain (saith he) of any Book, if once we call in question those Works that the Church that is extended throughout the whole World receives with a common consent, and if on the contrary we authorise as Apostolical Books

(p) *Testis idoneus tacet, loquitur autem minus idoneus. Apud Aug. cont. Faust. lib. 17. c. 1.*

(q) *De quo libro certum erit cujus sit, si litera quas Apostolorum dicit & tenet Ecclesia ab ipsis Apostolis propagata, & per omnes gentes tantâ eminentiâ declarata, utrum Apostolorum sint incertum est; & hoc erit certum scripsisse Apostolos quod huic Ecclesiæ contrarii heretici proferunt Auctorum suorum nominibus appellati longè post Apostolos existentium. Aug. ibid.*

that

that dispute therewith, and that carry the name of Writers who have lived a long time after the Apostles. He charges them (r) with making Fables and Apocryphal Works to pass for Apostolical Writings: and sheweth at the same time the falsity of these Acts, because they have not any testimony of the Doctors of the Church that were then living. He urgeth *Fauftus* to prove what he hath alledged, by Books that are Canonical, and generally received in all the Churches: *Non ex quibuscunque literis, sed Ecclesiasticis, Canonicis, Catholicis.* This Holy Doctor calls this way of arguing of the *Manicheans* folly, *insaniam & dementiam*, who not being able to accommodate the Writings of the Apostles to the Idea that they had formed to themselves of the Christian Religion, or under colour of certain contradictions in the Scriptures, which they could not resolve (s) would needs have it believed that these Books were composed after the Apostles themselves by uncertain Authors, who had made bold to borrow the Names of these Apostles to gain Credit and Authority to their Works.

Aug. l. 23.
adv. Fau.
c. 9.

To convince them the more easily of their folly, he sets before their eyes the Books (t) of *Hippocrates, Plato, Aristotle, Varro* and *Cicero*, and of several other Writers, that are believed to be the Authors of those Works that we have under their Names, because they have been attributed to them in the time wherein they lived, and they have been always so attributed successively from Age to Age. Now there is nothing more contrary to reason, than not to grant the same privilege to the Church, and not to acknowledge that she hath faithfully kept the Writings of the Apostles, whose Doctrine she hath always preserved by the means of the Succession of Bishops.

We have enlarged a little on these Reflections of *S. Augustin*, and of the other Fathers that preceded him, because they have mightily evinced the Truth of the Books of the New Testament, without having recourse to I know not what particular Spirit, which is an in-

(r) *Legunt Scripturas apocryphas Manichæi à nescio quibus fabularum sutoribus sub Apostolorum nomine scriptas, quæ suorum scriptorum temporibus in auctoritatem sanctæ Ecclesiæ recipi mererentur, si sancti & docti homines qui tunc in hac vitæ erant, & examinare talia poterant, eos vera locutos esse cognoscerent.* Aug. cont. Fauſt. lib. 22. c. 79.

(s) *Non à Christi Apostolis, sed longo post tempore à quibusdam incertis n. minus viris, qui ne sibi non haberetur fides scribentibus quæ nesciens, partim Apostolorum nomina, partim eorum qui Apostolos secuti viderentur, scriptorum suorum frontibus indiderunt, asseverantes secundum eos se scripsisse quæ scripserint.* Apud Aug. lib. 32. cont. Fauſt. c. 2.

(t) *Platonis, Aristotelis, Ciceronis, Varronis, aliorumque ejusmodi autorum libros, unde noverunt homines quid ipsorum sint, nisi temporum sibiimet succedentium contestatione continuâ.* August. cont. Fauſt. lib. 33. c. 6.

Confess.
Art. 4.

vention of these later times. We cannot imagine any thing more opposite to good reason, than these Words of the Confession of Faith of those that formerly took the Name of the Reformed of the Churches of France: *We acknowledge these Books* (in speaking of the whole Scriptures) *to be Canonical, not so much by the common agreement and consent of the Church, as by the testimony and inward persuasion of the Holy Ghost.* The Fathers nevertheless have always confuted the ancient Hereticks who refused to acknowledge these Books as Canonical, *by the common agreement and consent of the Church.* It would have been a pleasant way of reasoning, if every one in these primitive times of Christianity, would not have acknowledged for divine Books, only those that his private Spirit should dictate to him to be such. This hath appeared to be so great an extravagance to those of that Persuasion, who in the *Low Countries* are called *Remonstrants*, that they look upon the *Calvinists* that follow this Principle, as People that have renounced common sense. *Simon Episcopus*, who hath been one of the Champions of this Party, after having handled this question with a great deal of subtilty, concludes that it is a very ill sort of argumentation, to admit besides the testimony of the Church, another inward testimony of the Holy Ghost, to know whether certain Books have a divine Authority stamp upon them. *Hinc patet* (saith this Protestant) *ineptos esse eos, qui vel præter vel citra testimonium Ecclesiæ requiri aiunt internum Spiritus Sancti testimonium, ad hoc ut libros hos divinos esse, & auctoritatem divinam habere intelligamus.*

Remonst.
Confess. c.
1. de scrip.
n. 8.

It is sufficient according to the Remonstrants, that we have there upon the testimony of (v) the primitive Church, that certainly knew that these Books were written by the Apostles, or approved by them, and that this testimony is come down to us by a constant Tradition. This Spirit that is diffused through the whole Church, ought without doubt to be preferred to a private Spirit, that can only serve to make a division therein. This is what *Grotius* hath judiciously observed: *Spiritus ille privatus* (saith this Critick) *Spiritus Ecclesiæ divisor.*

Grot. Animad. in
Anim.
Riv.

It would be to no purpose for the *Calvinists* to object to the Remonstrants, that their Opinion is taken out of the Writings of *Socinus*; because an evident truth ought not to be rejected, under pretence that it may be found in the Books of *Socinus*. This Heretick hath proved in his Treatise *Of the Authority of the Holy Scriptures*, and in

(v) *Ecclesia primitiva quæ temporibus Apostolorum fuit, certissimè resciscere potuit, & indubie etiam resciscit libros istos ab Apostolis scriptos esse, vel saltem approbatos, nobisque istius rei scientiam quasi per manus tradidit, ac veluti depositum quoddam reliquit.* Remonst. Confess. cap. 1. de Script. n. 8.

another Work intituled *Sacred Lectures*, the Truth of the Sacred Books, and principally of those of the New Testament, by the very same reasons, and after the same manner that S. Irenæus, Tertullian and S. Augustin have done. (x) Let them read (saith Socinus) that which Eusebius hath written on this matter in his Ecclesiastical History, and they will find therein a perpetual consent of all the Churches of the World, since these Books were written, to the time of this Author. He insists very much in these two Treatises on the Testimonies of the ancient Fathers. Will any one say for this, that this is a Socinian Method, because Socinus hath made use of it after the most Learned Ecclesiastical Writers? Would to God that this Enemy of the Traditions of the Catholick Church had always followed this Principle! he would not have introduced so many Innovations into Religion. Neither can he avoid an Objection that may be made even by those of his own Party, that according to his Principles, he ought necessarily to acknowledge a Tradition after the same manner as it is maintained in the Church of Rome. We cannot (might they say to him) receive the Gospel of S. Matthew, and reject that which hath been published under the Name of S. Thomas, without establishing Tradition at the same time, because it is impossible to prove this by any Testimony of the Scriptures.

Socinus, To answer this Objection without departing from his Principle, lays down (y) a certain Medium between the Scriptures and Tradition; which Medium consists, according to his opinion, in written Histories, in other Testimonies and in Ratiocinations, from whence it is proved without making application to any Authority of the Church, that the Gospel of S. Matthew contains the true History of Jesus Christ, and that on the contrary, that which carries the name of S. Thomas is a supposititious Book. Episcopius and

(x) Legantur ea quæ hac de re Eusebius scribit pluribus in locis Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ, & invenietur usque ad illius Eusebii ætatem, hoc est per 250. circiter annorum perpetuum spatium, postquam scripta illa conscripta atque edita fuerunt, nunquam fuisse in Ecclesia quæ dubitaret quin quatuor quæ habemus Evangelia, liber Actorum Apostolorum, Epistolæ omnes quæ Pauli Apostoli esse dicuntur, præter eam quæ ad Hebræos est scripta, prior Apostoli Petri, & prima Joannis Apostoli, hæc, inquam, omnia ab iis scripta fuissent quibus attribuantur. Socin. lib. de Auct. Script. Sac.

(y) Est quiddam medium inter Scripturas & traditionem. Immo non quiddam modo, sed multiplex quiddam, scriptæ nimirum historiæ, aliæque testimonia & rationes, ex quibus factum est & sit ut cordati homines Matthei Evangelium pro vera de Jesu Christo historia habeant, Thomæ non habeant, nullâ hîc intercedente auctoritate Ecclesiæ & Spiritûs quo ipsa perpetuo gubernetur. Soc. Epist. 4. ad Christoph. Ostorod.

the other *Remonstrants* do also make use of this Answer, that they may not be obliged to acknowledge the Traditions of the Church. But this Medium which they suppose to be between the Scriptures and Tradition, is a true Tradition, which differs in nothing from that which *S. Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Epiphanius*, *S. Augustin* and several other Fathers have established, when they intended to convince the ancient Hereticks of the Truth of the Apostolical Books. These Histories, and these other Acts whereof *Socinus* makes mention, are taken from the Churches, or from Ecclesiastical Writers; and this is that which composeth Tradition. He ought to agree to it himself, since he avoucheth in his *Treatise of the Authority of the Holy Scriptures*, that since the times of the Apostles to those of *Eusebius*, none have doubted in the Church, that the Books of the New Testament were not composed by those, whose Names they bear. For it is certain that many Hereticks that were out of the Church, have not only doubted thereof, but have absolutely rejected them. That which hath deceived *Socinus* and the other Sectaries, is a false notion that they have conceived of the Authority of the Church; they imagine that she Judges by her own Authority only, and not upon good Acts and Records, that the Books that compose the Old and New Testament are Divine and Canonical.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the Titles that are at the Head of the Gospels and other Books of the New Testament: Whether these Titles were made by the Authors of these Books, or whether they were since added?

WE have no solid proof in Antiquity, to make it appear to us, that the Names that are set at the Head of every Gospel, were thereunto prefixed by those who are the Authors of them: *S. John Chrysostom* assures us expressly of the contrary in one of his Homelies: (a) *Moses* (saith this Learned Bishop) hath not put his

(a) Μωσῆς οὐκ ἐτίθηκε τίτλους ἐν ἀρχῇ τῶν βιβλίων τῶν εὐαγγελίων, ἀλλ' οἱ αὐτοὶ ἐκείνων, καὶ οἱ συντάκται· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Ματθαῖος, οὐδὲ Ἰωάννης, οὐδὲ Μάρκος, οὐδὲ Λουκᾶς. Ὁ δὲ Μάρκος Παῦλος παρὰ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιστολῶν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ προτίθησι, τί δὲ ποτε; ὅτι ἐκείνοι μὴ παρέσαν ἕναρον, καὶ ἀπερὶ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ὀνόματος οὐκ ἔδεικνυν παρρησίαν, ὥστε καὶ διὰ μακροῦ τὰ γεγραμμένα διωκόμενοι, καὶ ἐν ἐπιστολῇ ἑαυτοῦ διδὼν τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ προτίθησθαι. Joann. Chryf. Hom. 1. in Epist. ad Rom.

Name to the five Books of the Law that he hath wrote: those also that have collected the Acts after him, have not set their Names at the beginning of their Histories. The same may be said of the Evangelists *Matthew, Mark, Luke* and *John*. As for *S. Paul*, he hath always set his Name at the beginning of his Epistles, except that which is directed to the *Hebrews*: and the Reason that *S. John Chrysostom* produceth is, because the former wrote for the use of Persons that were present; whereas *S. Paul* wrote Letters to persons that were at a distance. If we should refer our selves herein to the Testimony of this Father, we cannot prove precisely from the Titles only that are at the Head of every Gospel, that these Gospels have been composed by those whose Names they bear, at least if we do not joyn to this, the Authority of the Primitive Church, that hath added these Titles. On this Principle it is that *Tannervs* and other Jesuits supported themselves in a Conference that they had at *Ratisbonne* with some Protestants, to shew that they could not clearly prove the Title of *S. Matthew*, and without the Testimony of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, that this Gospel was made by him whose name it bore: they insisted that they could not bring other Proofs of this Truth than those that were taken from humane Authority, and not from the Scriptures themselves, since they had been added to them: *Ex solo testimonio hominum, eorumque non omnium, sed eorum tantum qui Ecclesie corpus constituunt.* * A Protestant Divine, who had assisted at this Conference, hath composed a Book on purpose on this Subject, to prove the contrary to that which the Jesuits maintained. But to say the truth, there is more of Subtily in these sorts of Disputes than of solid Arguments: for although it were true that *S. Matthew* is the Author of the Title of his Gospel, recourse must always be had to the Authority of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, to shew that this Title is of him, and that this Gospel certainly belongs to him whose Name it bears; at least if we decline flying to a private Spirit, which hath been above discoursed, and cannot be approved by any judicious Persons.

These Titles are so ancient in the Church, that *Tertullian* reproves *Marcion*, who acknowledged the Gospel of *St. Luke*, from which he had only took away some Passages, (b) for having no Title at the head of his Copy; as if it were not lawful for him (saith this Father) to annex a Title to a Work, the Text whereof he had ventured to corrupt. He adds further in this same place, That he could not

(b) *Marcion Evangelio scilicet suo nullum adscribit auctorem: quasi non licuerit illi titulum quoque adungere, cui nefas non fuit ipsum corpus evantere. Tertull. lib. 4. adv. Marc. cap. 2.*

proceed in the Dispute that he held with this Heretick, since he had a right to reject a Book as suspected, the Title whereof did not appear; that he was willing, nevertheless, thus far to condescend to him, because it is easie (c) to judge by the Copy of *S. Luke* that was read in the Church, whether that of *Marcion* were the same, excepting that which he had cut off from it. It is not to be inferred that *Tertullian* was of Opinion that it might be proved by the Titles only, that the Gospels belonged to those whose Names they bore; otherwise he ought to have acknowledged as the true Gospels, an infinite number of false Books that carried the Names of the Apostles: It was necessary, according to his mind, to have besides this, a constant Tradition founded on the Testimonies of those who had lived before; therefore he adds at the same time, that (d) altho *Marcion* should have published his Gospel even under the name of *S. Paul*, this Title would have availed nothing, at least if it had not been accompanied with these Testimonies.

Ibid.

He goes yet farther in declaring that he did not take advantage of the Title that is at the beginning of *S. Luke* in the Copies of the Church, *De titulo quoque funis ducendus est contentioniis pari hinc inde nisu fluctuante.* For as to the Title alone *Marcion* might say, as well as the Orthodox, That the Gospel which he produced was the true one. (e) To which then shall we adhere? (saith *Tertullian*) by what Rule may we determine which is the true Gospel, whether that of *Marcion* that hath been corrupted, or that of the Church which is supposed to be entire, at least if regard be had to Antiquity? inasmuch that the most ancient should be the true, because the verity of an Act always preceeds the corruption of the same. *In quantum enim falsum corruptio est veri, in tantum præcedat necesse est veritas falsum.* On this uncontrollable Principle he makes it appear that the true Copy of *S. Luke* was that which the Orthodox made use of, since *Marcion* himself had not acknowledged any other before he had separated from the Church, which he accused of Judaizing; and he chiefly defended himself with this pretended Judaism, from the Charge of not receiving this Gospel entire, which he said had been interpolated by those that authorized Judaism: *Interpolatum à protectoribus Judaismi.*

(c) *Ex iis commentatoribus quos habemus, Lucam videtur Marcion elegisse quem caderet.* Tertull. ibid.

(d) *Si sub ipsius Pauli nomine Evangelium Marcion intulisset, non sufficeret ad fidem singularitas instrumenti destituta patrocinio antecessorum.* Tertull. ibid.

(e) *Ego meum dico verum, Marcion suum. Ego Marcionis affirmo adulteratum, Marcion meum. Quis inter nos determinabit, nisi temporis ratio ei præscribens auctoritatem, quod antiquius reperiatur, & ei præjudicans vitiationem, quod posterius revincetur?* Tertull. ibid. cap. 4.

Lastly,

Lastly, *Tertullian* concludes, That there was no other true Copy of *S. Luke* but his, because it was before that which *Marcion* had corrected; and the Reason that he alledgeth is this, That he could not amend any but that which was in the Church, and was consequently antecedent to his. *Id emendans quod invenit, & id posterius quod de nostro, emendatione constituens suum & novum fecit.* But since it might be objected to him, that it is not always true, that the most ancient Books are the most correct, because they also may have been corrupted, at least if they be not the true Originals: he answers, that it is necessary to look back to the time of the Apostles, to be certain that we have their genuine Writings. (f) Now we are assured (according to his Opinion) that a thing belongs to the times of the Apostles, when we see that it hath been inviolably preserved in the Apostolical Churches.

All these Arguments of *Tertullian* prove, that the constant Tradition of the Church is the mark by which we distinguish the Divine and Canonical Books from those that are not so; and that it is this same Church that hath added, or at least approved of the Titles of the four Gospels, to denote to us, that these Gospels were written by Apostles, or by their Disciples; which does not in the least agree with this private Spirit of some Protestants. It seems that *Beza* believed that the Titles of the Gospels were no less dictated by the Holy Ghost than the Text it self: this he insinuates in his Answer to the Defense of *Castalio*, whom he reprehends for having translated in his Latin Version of the New Testament these Greek Words, *καὶ Ματθαῖος*, by these, *auctore Matthæo*. *Maldonat* hath observed with much more Judgment, (g) That it is not the custom of the sacred Writers to put Titles at the beginning of their Works; but that they either omit them altogether, or they include them within the first Words of their Books, which he demonstrates by Examples taken out of the Old Testament; whence he infers, that it is probable that the Evangelists are not the Authors of the Titles of their Gospels. He proves it also by the Example of *S. Mark*, who would have put two Titles to his Book, if he were the Author of the first that runs thus, *The Gospel according to Mark*, because he begins his History with these other Words, *The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ*. He adds farther, That if the Evangelists had been

*Th. Beza
Resp. ad
defens. &
reprehens.
Seb. Castal.
Mal.*

(f) *In summa si constat id verius quod prius, id prius quod & ab initio, ab initio quod ab Apostolis; pariter utique constabit, id esse ab Apostolis traditum, quod apud Ecclesias Apostolorum fuerit sacrosanctum.* *Tertull. ibid. cap. 5.*

(g) *Non est Sacrorum Scriptorum consuetudo, ut ante initium librorum titulos ponant, sed ut vel omittant, vel prima libri verba titulum faciant.* *Maldon. Comm. in cap. I. Matth.*

Maldon.
ibid.

the Authors of these Titles, there would not have been found so great an uniformity amongst them as appears; they would have made use of different Expressions, as they do in the other parts, where they relate the same things, but in different terms: instead of writing all, *The Gospel according to N.* Again he confirms his Opinion by the diversity that is found among the *Greek* and *Latin* Copies; for these last read, *The holy Gospel of Jesus Christ according to N.* which proceeds from this (saith Maldonat) that the *Greek* Church hath put the *Greek* Title, and the *Latin* Church the *Latin*: quod Græcum Titulum Græca, Latinum Latina.

Nov. Test.
Arab. edit.
Roma, an.
1591.

It seems that *Beza* in this case chose rather to prefer the Title of the *Latin* Copy before that of the *Greek*, when he accuseth *Castalio* of having falsly translated *auctore Matthæo*; as if *S. Matthew* had been the Author of his Gospel: for, to confute his Adversary with more force, he saith, (b) *That we read not the Gospel of Matthew, Mark, Luke or John, but the Gospel of Jesus Christ according to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, as it is in all the Latin Copies.* Nevertheless this Reading is not found but in the *Latin* Version, and not in all the *Latin* Copies neither. If *Maldonat* may be believed, there is only the *Arabick* Version printed at *Rome*, where it is read, *The Gospel of Jesus Christ according as it hath been written by S. Matthew, one of his twelve Disciples.* But it is easie to judge, that this *Arabick* Title hath been taken in part from the *Latin*; and those who have copied or translated these *Arabick* Gospels, have added the rest; therefore we read in the two other *Arabick* Editions, *The Gospel of Matthew, or of St. Matthew.* It is no otherwise in the *Syrack*, the *Ethiopic*, and the *Persian*: in a word, it is only in the *Latin* Version where it is read, *The Gospel of Jesus Christ*; which is an apparent Imitation of the first Words of the Gospel of *St. Mark*. However it be, the Opinion of *St. John Chrysostom*, who believed that none of the Gospels were written with the Titles that are at present prefixed to them, seems to me more probable than that of some Authors, especially among the Protestants, who attribute them to the Evangelists, and will have them to be a part of the Gospels. It is much more likely, that the Primitive Christians have annexed them thereunto in those times wherein it was evident that these Gospels did truly belong to those Persons whose Names are put to them: on this account it is, that we find the Name of *S. Luke* added to the beginning of some MSS. *Greek* Copies of the Acts of the

(b) Neque enim legimus, Evangelium Matthæi, Marci, Luca, vel Joannis; sed, Evangelium Jesu Christi, ut habent omnes Latini codices, secundum Matthæum, Marcum, Lucam, & Joannem. Bez. Resp. ad Castal. p. 12.

Apostles, as I have observed in three MSS. of the King's Library. We read in two of these Manuscripts, (i) *The Acts of the Apostles by Luke the Evangelist*; and in the other, (k) *The Acts of the Holy Apostles by Luke an Apostle*.

Furthermore, the Greek Word *Εὐαγγέλιον*, Gospel, which signifieth literally *Good News*, is taken here for Preaching, insomuch that the Gospel of S. Matthew is nothing else but the Preaching of this Apostle, who hath made a Collection of the Actions and Words of his Master: therefore the Syrians have entituled this Gospel, *The Nov. Test. Gospel, the Preaching of Matthew*. The Arabick Versions that have *Syr.* been taken from the Syriack, do also make use of an Arabick Word that signifies Preaching.

I do not think it necessary that I should insist on these Words *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, *κατὰ Μάρκον*, according to Matthew, according to Mark, as some Commentators on the New Testament have done; it seems to me to be too nicely explained. They imagine, that those that have put these Titles have made choice of this Expression on purpose, to shew that neither Matthew, Mark, Luke nor John, were the Authors of the Gospels, but that they had only written them: this seems to me to be a pure Subtilty; for, according to the Style of those times, *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, according to Matthew, is the same thing with *Ματθαῖος*, of Matthew. It was said after the same manner, the Gospel *κατὰ Ἑβραῖους* according to the Hebrews, and *κατὰ Αἰγυπτίους*, according to the Egyptians, that is to say, of the Hebrews, and of the Egyptians; as it hath been also said *κατὰ Φρυγίους*, the Heresie according to the Phrygians, which is the same thing as *κατὰ Φρυγίαν*, the Heresie of the Phrygians. Beza himself, who was so excessively transported against Castalio about the Version of these Words *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, which he had translated *auctore Matthæo*, confesseth, that it is commonly said, the Gospel of S. Matthew and of S. Mark, as it is said the Epistles of S. Paul and of S. Peter: but he was afraid lest this Title of Castalio should cause it to be believed that the Evangelists are strictly the Authors of the Gospels that they have published, whereas they are only the simple Scribes or Writers of them; as if in the very Elegancy of the Latin Tongue, *Auctor* was not the same thing as *Scriptor*. They that affirm that this Expression *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, according to Matthew, seems to denote that St. Matthew and the other Evangelists had not written their Gospels themselves, have a great deal more reason to fear, lest they should be only Collections that their Disciples had made of the preachings of their Masters. But this Ob-

(i) *Λογα. εὐαγγελιστῆ περὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων*. MSS. Reg. n. 2869. & 2248.

(k) *Περὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων διὰ Λογα. ἀποστόλου*. MSS. Reg. n. 2872.

jection is answered at one stroke, by making it appear that there is no difference as to the sense, between these two Expressions, *καὶ Ματθαῖον according to Matthew*, and *Ματθαῖν, of Matthew*. Castalio, who professeth rather to render the Sense than the Letter, hath not ill translated *auctore Matthæo*: and therefore *Beza* was in the wrong, in taking an occasion from thence to accuse him for having denied the Inspiration of the Sacred Books.

*Grot. An-
not. in tit.
Matth.*

I cannot but wonder that *Grotius* should insist on this nicety of *Beza*, and that he hath remarked after him, in his Notes on this Passage of St. *Matthew*, that the ancient Title was not simply *Εὐαγγέλιον*, Gospel, but *Εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, the Gospel of Jesus Christ, after the same manner as it is in the beginning of S. *Mark*. He judges this to be the reason why it was not put *Εὐαγγέλιον Ματθαῖν*, the Gospel of Matthew, but *καὶ Ματθαῖον*, according to Matthew. This Observation hath no foundation; for *καὶ Ματθαῖον*, according to Matthew, and *Ματθαῖν*, of Matthew, are the same thing, as hath been proved above. We see also, that the *Syriack* Version, the *Arabick* (except the Copy of *Rome*), that hath been apparently alter'd in this point from the *Latin*) the *Ethiopick* and the *Persian*, all read the Gospel of Matthew.

The great antiquity of this Title *Εὐαγγέλιον*, Gospel, is ordinarily proved by these words of St. *Justin Martyr*, in his Apology for the Christians, (1) *The Apostles in the Acts that they have committed to Writing, that are called Gospels*. Instead of the word *Acts*, it is in the Greek of this Father *ἀπομνημονεία*. We have at this day four Books of *Xenophon* extant, wherein he relates the Words and Actions of *Socrates*, that are entituled *Ξενοφώντος ἀπομνημονεία*, and in *Latin*, according to the Translation of Cardinal *Bessarion*, *Xenophonis de factis & dictis Socratis memoratu dignis*. It is in this same sense that this holy Martyr cites the Gospels in his Dialogues against *Trypho*, under the Title of *ἡ ἀποστολὴ ἀπομνημονεία*, as if the Apostles had had no other design in their Writings that have been called Gospels, than to publish the Words and Actions of Jesus Christ.

*Just. Mar.
in Dial.
cont.
Tryph.*

Moreover, it is worth the observing, that although the Apostles were not the Authors of the Titles that are set at the head of their Gospels, we ought nevertheless to receive them after the same manner as if they had put them there themselves, because they are derived from the first beginnings of Christianity, and are further authorized by a constant Tradition of all the Churches of the World. *Erasmus*, who found a great difficulty in concluding concerning the

(1) Οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις ταῖς αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονείαις ἢ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια.
Just. Mart. in Apol.

Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, that bears not the Name of St. Paul, protests, that if the Church hath pronounced any thing thereupon, he would readily submit to her Decision, which he prefers before all the Reasons that may be proposed to him. *Plus apud me valet (saith this Critick) Ecclesiae iudicium, quam ullae rationes humane.* *Erasm. declar. ad Theol. Paris.*

CHAP. III.

Concerning Books that have been published under the Name of Jesus Christ and the Apostles. Of several other Acts forged by the ancient Hereticks. Reflections on the whole matter.

IT hath been observed above, that Jesus Christ never published any Work to make known his Doctrine, and that he did not so much as give order to his Disciples to write that which he had taught them, but only to preach it to all the Nations of the Earth: nevertheless, there have been found Impostors who have set forth Books under his Name, and have attributed to him certain Acts written in form of Letters, the forgery whereof discovers it self, in regard they are directed to *Peter* and *Paul*. They have not minded, when they composed these Letters, that *Paul* was not the Disciple of Jesus Christ till after the Death of the same Jesus Christ. (a) How then could it be (saith St. *Augustin*) that he should write to *Peter* and *Paul*, as to his dear Disciples with whom he conversed familiarly, since this latter was not then in the number of his Disciples? Besides, these Books were full of Secrets, or rather Superstitions, of the Art that is called Magick; which in no wise agrees with Jesus Christ, who hath always professed, and the Christians after him, to condemn this kind of Superstition. It is probable, that whereas his extraordinary Actions were famous throughout the World, and his Miracles surprizing, they took occasion from thence to feign this Work to disperse abroad I know not what magical Secrets, which they pretended he had put in practice: indeed the *Jews*, who were his Enemies, not being able to deny the truth of his Mi-

(a) *Quomodo potuit libros quos, antequam moretetur, eum scripsisse putari voluit, ad discipulos tanquam familiarissimos Petrum & Paulum scribere, cum Paulus nondum fuerit discipulus ejus? August. de Consen. Evan. lib. 1. c. 10.*

Apud
Origen,
lib. 1. cont.
Cels.
racles, gave it out every where that he was a Magician. They have not been ashamed also to set down these Fables in their *Talmud*, and to say that Jesus had learned in *Egypt* the most subtil Mysteries of Magick. *Celsus* reproaches the ancient Christians almost after the same manner, under the Person of a *Jew* whom he introduces to speak. This *Epicurean* Philosopher attributes the miraculous Actions of Jesus to Magick, or rather to a certain Art that was learned (as he saith) in *Egypt*.

Gelas.
decr. 1.
par. dist.
15. c. 3.
The Letter of Jesus Christ to *Agbar* King of *Edeffa*, seems not to be so far from Truth, because *Eusebius* that produceth it with the Letter of this Prince to Jesus, assures us, that he hath taken these two pieces from the *Archives* of *Edeffa*, that contained the Records of what hath passed under the Reign of *Agbar*, and that they were still kept in his time written in *Syriack*, which was the Language of the Country; from whence they were translated into *Greek*. Nevertheless Pope *Gelasius* had reason to reject this Letter of our Saviour to *Agbar* as Apocryphal: *Epistola Jesu ad Agbarum apocrypha*. I am apt to believe that these Letters were really found in the *Archives* of the City of *Edeffa*; but we ought not too easily to give credit to the first Originals of Churches: every one strives to advance their Antiquity as much as is possible, and they make no scruple on such occasions to counterfeit Acts when they have none that are true.

Aug. lib. 1.
de conf.
c. 7.
Eusebius appeared much more judicious when he rejected, as Tales made at pleasure, certain Parables and Preachments that *Papias* attributed to Jesus Christ, and avouched that he heard them reported by those very Persons that had learnt them of the Apostles. We ought then to take it for a certain Maxim, that Jesus Christ hath written nothing, and that we have nothing of his but what we have received from his Apostles. This gave occasion to some Pagans who had a Veneration for him, to say, (c) That they could not believe the Gospel, because he had not written it himself; and that his Disciples, who were the Authors thereof, had took upon them too much in making him God. S. *Augustin* confutes these People in his first Book of the Consent of the Gospels; They attribute (saith he, in speaking of these Pagans) a most excellent Wisdom to Jesus Christ; but they always consider him as a Man,

(b) Ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς δημοτοῖς χάρταις, τοῖς τὰ παλαιὰ καὶ τὰ ἀμὲν τὸν Ἀγλαῶν ἀποστόλῃν δέχουσι. Euseb. Hitt. Eccles. lib. 1. c. 13.

(c) Nolunt Evangelio credere, quia non ab ipso (Jesu) illa conscripta sunt, sed ab ejus Discipulis, quos existimant ei divinitatem, qua crederetur Deus, errore tribuisse. Aug. lib. 2. Retract. c. 16.

and they pretend that his Disciples have bestowed Qualifications upon him that he had not: they declare that they have a disposition to believe his Word, in case he had himself committed it to Writing, but refuse notwithstanding to give credit to the preaching of the Apostles. S. *Augustin* propounds to them the example of *Pythagoras* and *Socrates*, two of the greatest Men of the Pagan Antiquity, who have written nothing of their own Actions, no more than Jesus Christ, and yet they do not for this reason decline referring themselves to their Disciples herein. He demands of them (*d*) why they rather believe the Disciples of these two Philosophers in that which they have written concerning them?

This arguing of S. *Augustin* manifestly supposeth that we have no Writings of Jesus Christ: and this is what he affirms in express terms in another place, where he answers *Faustus*, who pretended that we ought to seek for that which Jesus had said of himself: *Quærendum esse quid de se Jesus ipse prædicaverit*. Can this be known otherwise (saith this Father) than by the Writings of his Disciples? *Numquid hoc sciri potest, nisi discipulis ejus narrantibus?* (*e*) If there were (adds he) any Writings that had been truly of Jesus Christ, how comes it to pass that they were not read nor received in his Church, and that they were not set in the highest rank therein? This also is the Opinion of *Origen* in his first Book against *Celsus*, where he acknowledgeth that Jesus hath published nothing of his Actions; that we know them only by the Relations of his Disciples in their Gospels. Orig. l. 1.
cont. Cels.

As for what concerns false Gospels, false Acts, false Apocalypses or Revelations, and other pieces of the like nature that have been composed under the Names of the Apostles, there hath been so great a number of them, that it would be very difficult to describe them all exactly. Pope *Gelasius* hath furnished a Catalogue of them long enough, which hath been inserted into the Decretal of *Gratian*: Decr. 1.
part. dist.
15. c. 3. and altho these false Books have been almost all lost, yet there are some Fragments of them remaining in the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers. S. *Luke* seems to have written his Gospel, only because some, who had undertaken the same thing before him, had not acquitted themselves faithfully therein. This is the Sense that the Fathers ge-

(d) *Quid igitur causa est cur de istis hoc credant, quod de illis discipuli eorum literis commendaverunt; & de Christo nolunt credere quod ejus de illo Discipuli conscripserunt?* Aug. ibid.

(e) *Unde fieri poterat, ut si verè ipsius essent, non legerentur, non acciperentur, non præcipuo culmine auctoritatis emerent in ipsius Ecclesiâ, quæ ab ipso per Apostolos succedentibus sibiimè Episcopis usque ad hæc tempora propagata ditatur?* Aug. cont. Faust. lib. 28. c. 4.

Luc. i. 1.

nerally give to the first words of this Evangelist, when they explain the Greek Word *ἐπιχέουσιν*, which is translated in the vulgar *Latin comati sunt*. Many (saith *Theophylact*) have written Gospels, and (f) we have Examples of them in that which is called *The Gospel of the Egyptians*, and in another intituled *The Gospel of the Twelve*. These People (adds he) have only made an attempt, but they have not finished. The common Opinion of the ancient Interpreters of the Scriptures, whether *Greek* or *Latin*, is that *S. Luke* designed to mark out in this place those Writers that durst publish false Gospels. *Pseudopostolos* (saith *Baronius*) & *Pseudoscriptores his suggillatos verbis a Luca firma est Patrum sententia*. Nevertheless many of them have been deceived, when they have produced as Examples of these false Gospels, Writings that have not been published till after the time of *S. Luke*.

*Baron. an.
Christ. 58
n. 31.*

This hath given occasion to some Learned Commentators on the New Testament to doubt of the Explication that the Fathers have brought of this Greek Word *ἐπιχέουσιν*, who take it in a bad sense in this passage. *Maldonat* after he hath rehearsed in few words what several Fathers have thought thereupon, adds, (g) that he will not recede from the common Opinion, altho it be not grounded on any convincing Reason, because the Verb *ἐπιχέουσιν* may also be explained in a good sense. But whether there were any false Gospels or not, before *S. Luke* published his, we cannot doubt but a great number of them have been forged since that time, of which the Hereticks have been the Authors. I will not here speak of that of the *Nazareans*, which was called also the Gospel *α.δ.* *Ἐβραῖος*, according to the Hebrews, because I am persuaded that this Gospel was the Original of *S. Matthew*, into which they afterwards inserted some Additions, as I shall shew hereafter.

The *Ebionites* who read this same Gospel of *S. Matthew* according to the Hebrews, (h) had others also which they had substituted under the Names of the Apostles, especially of *James* and *John*, that they might the more easily impose on those of their own Sect, by those false Gospels that went under the Names of the Disciples of Jesus Christ. They had the impudence even to counterfeit new Acts of the Apostles, which they filled with Impieties and Defamations

(f) Οἷον ἐστὶ τὸ κατ' Ἀιγυπτίους καὶ τὸ ἐπιγραφόμενον τῷ Μελκί. Οἱ τοῦτοι ἐν ἐπιχέουσιν μόνον, ὡς μὲν τοι καὶ ἐτελείωσαν. *Theophyl. Comm. in c. 1. Luc. vers. 1.*

(g) A quâ sententiâ, non quod certâ mihi ratione probari posse videatur, sed quod omnibus vulgò probari videam, nolo discedere. *Maldon. Comm. in c. 1. Luc. vers. 1.*

(h) Τῶν ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματα εἰς τὴν ἑβραϊκὴν ἡπατημένων καὶ αὐτῶν πειθὺν παραποιήτως λέγοντες· βίβλος τε ἔστι ὀνόματος αὐτῶν πλασθέντος ἀντιγράφου. *Epiph. Har. 30. n. 23.*

against

against S. Paul, whom they called, by way of raillery, *The man of Tarsus*, being desirous to prove from thence that he was not a Jew by Nation, but a Proselyte, and one born of Parents that had been converted from Gentilism to the Religion of the Jews. Nevertheless Eusebius assures us, that these Hereticks did not receive any but the Gospel called *According to the Hebrews*, and that they had but little esteem for the others. In regard that they had preserved Judaism with the Christian Religion, they absolutely rejected the Epistles of S. Paul, whom they treated as an Apostate, because he had (said they) abandoned the old Law, *ὑποτάττω ἀποσπῶντες αὐτὸν τῷ νόμῳ.* Eusebius
Hist. Eccl.
lib. 3. c. 27.

The Gnosticks who fancied themselves to have a more perfect knowledge of Religion than all the other Christians, and looked upon the Apostles, as Men that were but rude and stupid even when they published their Gospels, composed a Work in Verse, which they called *Ἐυαγγέλιον τελείως*, the Gospel of Perfection. (i) They made use of a Gospel also that they attributed to S. Philip, a Disciple of Jesus Christ, some words whereof Epiphanius relates. Some of this same Sect that was divided into several Branches, had invented a Gospel intituled *Ἐυαγγέλιον Ἐβας*, the Gospel of Eve, wherein they scattered their wild conceits under the Name of this Woman, whom they considered as a perfect Gnostick, who had received great illuminations in the Conference that she held with the Serpent. Epiph.
Her. 26.
n. 22.

The Sethians who were another sort of Gnosticks, who boasted, that they took their original from Seth, whom they believed to be Jesus Christ, had forged (k) an Apocalypse under the Name of the Patriarch Abraham. S. Epiphanius observes judiciously, that the design of these Gnosticks in publishing so many false Books under such great Names was to delude the simple, and to cause them to believe that they were ignorant of nothing concerning the Life of Jesus Christ. Those amongst them who were called *Marcosians*, had composed certain false Histories of his Infancy, wherein they observed after what manner he had learned to read. Epiph.
Her. 34.
n. 18.

The Encratites who acknowledged for the Author of their Sect the famous Tatian, a Disciple of S. Justin Martyr, (l) adhered to the Acts of S. Andrew, S. John, S. Thomas, and some other Apocryphal Books, as it were to the Authentical Scriptures. Those that

(i) Προσφέρεισι ὃ εἰς ὄνομα Φιλύππου τῷ ἀγίῳ μαθητῇ εὐαγγέλιον πεπλασμένον. Epiph. ibid. n. 13.

(k) Ἀποκάλυψιν ἔχοντος ὀνόματος Ἀβραάμ. Epiph. Her. 39. n. 4.

(l) Κεχρηλωται γεγραμῆς προσηγορίαις πῶς λεγόμεναι Ἀνδρέου καὶ Ἰωάννου προέξεισι καὶ Θωμᾶ καὶ ἀποκρυφίαις πάσι. Epiph. Her. 47. n. 1.

took the Name (*m*) of Apostolical, and were a Branch of the *Encratites* relied after their example on the false Acts of *S. Andrew* and *S. Thomas* (*n*) the *Origenians*, whose Opinions came near to those of *Epiphanius*, who was of the Sect of the *Gnosticks*, made use also of the Acts attributed to *S. Andrew*, and of some other Books of the same nature. The (*o*) *Manicheans* had composed a Gospel under the name of *Thomas*, and they made choice of this name of a Gospel to impose on the simple. *Cyril of Jerusalem* who lived a little after the first appearance of this Sect, attributes this Gospel to one of the Disciples of *Manes* named *Thomas* (*p*) Let none (saith this Holy Bishop) read the Gospel of *Thomas*; for he is not one of the twelve Apostles, but one of the three wicked Disciples of *Manes*. The Names of these three Disciples, according to the testimony of the same *Cyril*, were *Thomas*, *Baddas* and *Hermas*. Nevertheless Pope *Gelasius* condemns it, as belonging (as they said) to the Apostle *S. Thomas*. *Evangelium nomine Thomæ Apostoli quo utuntur Manichæi apocryphum*. *S. Augustin* writing against *Faustus* hath made mention of certain Apocryphal Books which the *Manicheans* made use of, wherein were related several Actions of *S. Thomas*, of which he hath produced some Examples. But not to be tedious, I shall pass by many other Gospels that have been published under the Names of the Apostles; the Titles of them may be seen in the Catalogue of Pope *Gelasius*, who hath ranked them in the number of Apocryphal Books.

Altho the Church doth acknowledge as Canonical only two Epistles of *S. Peter*, that are also, but short; yet (if we believe the ancient Hereticks) he hath composed several other Works that are mentioned by *S. Jerome*, viz. certain Acts, a Gospel, an Apocalypse, and two other Books, (*q*) one of which was intituled, *The Preaching of Peter*, and the other, *The Judgment*. *Eusebius* who hath also taken notice of these Books attributed to *S. Peter*, adds,

(*m*) Ἀποστολικοὶ τῆς λεγομένης περὶ Ἄνδρέου καὶ Θωμᾶ τοῦ πλεῖστον ἐπισείονται. *Epiph. Hær. 61. n. 1.*

(*n*) Ὁρισμένοι κέχρηται ἀποκρύφοις ποτὶ, μάλιστα τῆς λεγομένης περὶ Ἄνδρέου καὶ ἑξ ἄλλων. *Epiph. Hær. 63. n. 2.*

(*o*) Ἐγενεσαν καὶ Μανιχαῖοι καὶ Θωμᾶν εὐαγγέλιον ἐπὶ ᾧ οὕτως ἐνομήσατο τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς περὶ τῆς διακρίσεως τῶν ψυχῶν καὶ ἀποκρίσεων. *Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. 4.*

(*p*) Μὴδεὶς ἀναγιγνωσκέτω τὸ κατὰ Θωμᾶν εὐαγγέλιον· ἡ γὰρ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐνδὸς καὶ διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἀλλ' ἐνδὸς καὶ κατὰ τὸν τῶν Μάνι μαθητῶν. *Id. Cyr. Catech. 6.*

(*q*) Unus Actuum ejus inscribitur; alius, Evangeliz; tertius, Prædicationis; quartus, Apocalypseos; quintus, Judicii. *Hieron. de Scriptor. Eccl. in Petr.*

that

Gelasius
decr. 1.
par. dist.
15. c. 3.

Aug. cont.
Faust. lib.
22. c. 79.

that they were generally rejected by all the Catholicks, (r) because it did not appear that any Ecclesiastical Writer had ever subscribed to their Authority: which is not true; for he avouches himself in another place, that *Clement of Alexandria* hath cited the *Apocalypse* of *S. Peter*: the same *Clement* hath also cited the Book that bears the Title of *Κήρυγμα Πέτρου*, *The Preaching of Peter*; he hath also produced some Fragments of these two Works; which *Origen* hath likewise done after him. It is probable, that *Eusebius* only intended to say, that no Ecclesiastical Author had quoted these Books as Divine and Canonical. After the same manner may be explained another Passage of his History, where after he had rejected as Apocryphal, the Gospels that had been published by the Hereticks, under the Names of *Peter*, *Thomas*, *Matthias* and some other Apostles, he adds, that no Ecclesiastical Writer since the Apostles to his time had made mention of these Gospels.

Euseb. Hist. Ecc. l. 3. c. 25.

Serapion Bishop of *Antioch* hath written a Letter on purpose against the Gospel that bears the name of *Peter*, on occasion of certain Christians of *Rhossus* in *Cilicia*, who having read this Gospel, were fallen into the Error. He saith in this Letter, that he embraced as well as they the Writings of *S. Peter* and the other Apostles, as the Word of *Jesus Christ*; but that he rejected this false Gospel that had been forged under the Name of *S. Peter*, and was not grounded on any Tradition. The Hereticks that were called *Docetes* made use thereof; and *Serapion* himself before he had examined it, had permitted those of *Rhossus* to read it; but afterwards having found some Passages therein contrary to the Orthodox Faith, he absolutely forbade them the reading it. *Sozomen* affirms (s) that the *Apocalypse* attributed to *S. Peter* was read even in his time every year on Good Friday in some Churches of *Palestine*, altho this Piece had been exploded by all Antiquity.

Seraph. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 12.

The ancient Ecclesiastical Authors do moreover make mention of certain Acts attributed to *S. Paul*, which *Eusebius* hath rejected as Apocryphal. (t) We receive not (saith this Historian) among the Books that are not suspected, that which is called the Acts of *Paul*; and he speaks of these Acts in another place (v) as a false and sup-

(r) "Οπ μήτε ἀρχαίων μήτε ἡμῶν ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς, ἢ ὅς αὐτῶν συνεχρίσαντο μαρτυρίας. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. c. 3.*

(f) Τὴν καλημῶν ἀποκάλυψιν Πέτρου ὡς νότον παντελῶς περὶ ἡμῶν ἀρχαίων δοκιμαδεύσαν ἐν πλὴν ἐκκλησίαις τῆ Παλαιστίνης εἰσὶν οὖν ἀπὸ ἐκείνου ἐκτος ἀναγνωστικῶν ἐχρῆμα ἐν τῇ ἐμῇ παροικίᾳ. *Sozom. Hist. Eccles. lib. 7. cap. 19.*

(t) "Οὐδὲ μὲν τὰς λεγόμενας αὐτῶ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀναμφιμάκτις παρέλιφα. *Euseb. lib. 3. Hist. Eccles. cap. 3.*

(v) Ἐν τοῖς νότοις κατατέχθω καὶ ἡ Παύλου περὶ αὐτοῦ γερὰ. *Euseb. lib. c. 24.*

Gelasius
decr. 1.
part. dist.
15. c. 3.

Epiph.
Hier. 38.
n. 2.

posititious Writing. Many other Books have been compiled under the Name of this Apostle, and among others an Apocalypse or Revelation, which Pope *Gelasius* hath inserted in the List of *Apocryphal* Pieces: *Revelatio quæ appellatur Pauli Apostoli apocrypha*. *Sozomen* hath observed, (x) that in his time the greatest part of the Monks very much esteemed this Apocalypse, tho it had no testimony of Antiquity. To gain more authority to it, they feigned that it had been found at *Tarsus* in *Cilicia*, buried under ground in *S. Paul's* House. The *Cainites* who acknowledged *Cain* for their Father, from whom they took their Name, had forged another Work, under the Title of *Ἀποκάλυψις Παύλου*, that contains the History of that which happened to *S. Paul* when he ascended into Heaven, where he learn'd things which he was not permitted to reveal. The *Gnosticks* adopted this Book for their use. I shall not insist on some Epistles that have been also published under the Name of *S. Paul*, because I shall have occasion to speak of them in another place.

Protev.
Jac. edit.
Basil. in 3.
ann. 1552.

Biblian.
in Epist.
nuncup.

Besides all these Acts counterfeited under the Names of the Apostles, of which scarce any thing is left but the Titles, we have others more entire that have been Printed, but they are so full of Fables and absurd Tales, that we cannot read them without being at the same time convinced of their falsity. Is there any thing for example, more ridiculous than the Gospel attributed to *Nicodemus*? There is nothing also that comes nearer to Fable, than the little Book intituled *Protevangelium Jacobi*, *The first Gospel of James*, wherein it is treated among other things concerning the Birth and Infancy of the blessed Virgin *Mary*. *William Postel* who first brought this false Gospel from the *Levant*, would persuade all the World to believe, that it was read publickly in the Eastern Churches, and that they did not there doubt of the Author thereof. He translated it out of *Greek* into *Latin*, and having sent his Translation to *Oporinus*, a Printer at *Basil*, *Bibliander* caused it to be Printed with this specious Title, *Protevangelion, sive de Natalibus Jesu Christi & ipsius matris Virginis Mariæ Sermo Historicus D. Jacobi Minoris consobrini & fratris Domini Jesu, Apostoli primarii, & Episcopi Christianorum primi Hierosolymis*. He added also some Notes thereto after his way with a Discourse, wherein he avoucheth after *Postel*, that this History of the Birth of *Jesus Christ*, and of the Virgin, passeth for an authentick Book in the Oriental Churches: *Authenticus habetur in Orientalibus Ecclesiis*. The *Greek* of this little Work hath also been printed afterwards at *Basil* with the *Latin* Version in a Collection of several Pieces,

(x) Τὴν δὲ τὴν ὡς ἀποκάλυψιν Παύλου τῆς ἀποστόλου προσεβόησαν, ὡς ἰδεῖς ἀρχαίως ἔχει πῶς τοι μοιχαλὸν ἱπανύπ. *Sozom. Hist. Eccles. lib. 7. c. 19.*

intituled,

intituled, *Monumenta Orthodoxa*. The Title that answers to that of the Latin Translation is thus expressed; *Πρωτευαγγέλιον ἢ περὶ γενήσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ τῆς ἀγίας παρθένου Μαρίας λόγος ἱστορικὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν καὶ ἀδελφῶν τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ἀποστόλων περὶ τοῦ καὶ ἐπισκόπου περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν ἱεροσολίμων.* An. 1569.

If the Commentary on the six days of the Creation, that *Leo Allatius* hath published under the Name of *Eusebius* Bishop of *Antioch* who lived at the beginning of the fourth Century, did certainly belong to that Bishop, the *Protevangelium* would be of sufficient Antiquity: there is found in this Book a considerable fragment of it, that is delivered in such manner, that the most fabulous part thereof is omitted. The Expression that *Eusebius* useth in citing it, makes it appear that he did not believe it to be of *St. James*, under whose name they had published it, but of another *James*: for observe how he speaks, (γ) *It is convenient here to peruse the History that one James relates of the Virgin Mary.* However it be, we find in the ancient Ecclesiastical Authors a part of the things that are contained in this little History, and that apparently come from the *Gnosticks*, who had written many Fables relating to the Birth of *Jesus Christ*, and the *Virgin*.

I admire that the Protestants who have caused this *Protevangelium* * *Orthodoxographia*. *Bibliander* seriously divulgeth the Impostures of *William Postel*, who had averred, that this *Protevangelium* was the beginning of the Gospel of *S. Mark*, and even the foundation of Evangelical History: this he repeats also in a little Discourse wherein he gives his Judgment of this Book. *Ipsē Postellus* (saith he) *æstimat* [*Protevangelium*] *ut gemmam inter Libros Theologicos, & Basilicæ fundamētum totius Historiæ Evangelicæ, & caput Evangelii secundum Marcum.* In a word, he forgets nothing that might set a value on this wicked Piece, which he thinks to be recommendable, because it hath not been reckoned in the number of the Apocryphal Books with the Gospels of *Nicodemus*, *Thomas*, and many others that are recited at large in the Catalogue of *Pope Gelasius*. But this proves only that the *Protevangelium* had not been as yet published in that time, or that not being translated into *Latin*, this Pope had took no cognisance thereof. Indeed he hath placed among the Apocryphal Works, a Book that treated on the same Subject, as may be judged, by the Title; *Liber de Nativitate Salvatoris* (saith *Gelasius*) & de * Ortho-
doxogr.
edit. Basil.
Lat. ann.
1555. &
ibid. Lat.
& Gr. an.
1569.
Biblian.
ibid.
Biblian.
in censu.
& judic.
Protevan.

(γ) Ἀξίον ὃ καὶ πᾶσι ἱστορίαις καὶ διέξιναι περὶ τῆς ἀγίας Μαρίας Ἰακώβου καὶ τῆς ἐπισκόπου.
Eustath. Comm. in Hex.

Gelas.
apud
Grat.
decr. 1.
parr. dist.
15. c. 3.

Sancta Maria, & de obfetrice Salvatoris, apocryphus. It were to be wished, that Father *Jerom Xavier*, a Missionary Jesuit, had not inserted so many very improbable things taken out of this sort of Books in his History of Jesus Christ written in the *Persian* Tongue.

It would be to no purpose for me to enlarge any farther on the false Acts that have been published under the names of the Apostles; it is enough to observe in general, that they have been for the most part invented by Hereticks that have been willing to support their Novelties, by attributing them to some Disciples of Jesus Christ. *Hegisippus*, who lived immediately after the Disciples of the Apostles, speaking of Apocryphal Books, testifies (z) that a part of these Books have been composed by the Hereticks of his time: therefore when the Primitive Fathers designed to judge whether a Book were Canonical or not, they have examined its Doctrine, to see if it were conformable to that which was taught in the Catholic Church: they have moreover consulted the ancient Ecclesiastical Authors who have lived since the Apostles to their times, that they might by this means know the Tradition. *Serapion* applied these two Rules to the Gospel that passed under the name of *S. Peter*, which was read by those of the Church of *Rhossus*, thinking that it did certainly belong to him whose name it bore. (a) We have found (saith this holy Bishop) in this Gospel, many things that agree with the true Religion of Jesus Christ; but there are also some things that are far from it. He judgeth in the same place, that the Act that had been produced to him was false, because it was not grounded on Tradition.

Serap. apud Euseb.
Hist. Eccles. lib. 6.
c. 12.

Not but that the Fathers have sometimes made use of Apocryphal Books, and have quoted even false Gospels; as for example, the Gospel that is called *τὸ Ἀγυπτίους*, according to the *Egyptians*, is not to be allowed as authentick for this very reason, that it is thought to be most ancient, and that mention is made thereof in *Clement* of *Alexandria*: it ought not to be rejected neither, under this pretence alone, that the *Gnosticks* and *Sabellians* have maintained their Errors by this Book. The Primitive Fathers, who have written against the *Pagans* and *Jews*, do sometimes follow in their Disputes, and even in their other Works, the method of Rhetoricians, who often employ Reasons purely probable, and doubtful Acts, after which we must not always regulate our selves. This is to be seen princi-

(z) Ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ πρὸς πᾶν αἰρετικὸν ἀναπειλάσας πρὸς τούτων. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 22.

(a) Ἐυρίην τὰ μὲν πλείονα τῶ ὁρθῷ λόγῳ τῶ σωτῆρος πρὸς τὸ πρὸς διδασκαλίαν. Serap. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 12.

pally in the Works of *Clement of Alexandria* and *Origen*. *Clement* hath on this account related some Words of *Jesus Christ*, (b) that are not to be found in the four Evangelists authorized by the Tradition of the Church; and he saith that they are in the Gospel of the *Egyptians*. He only quotes them after the Heretick *Cassian*, and in arguing with the Followers of *Basilides*, he refers to certain Writings attributed to *St. Barnabas*. On the other side, the Hereticks making Profession of Christianity as well as the Orthodox, have not always recourse to apocryphal and supposititious Pieces to defend their Innovations. Therefore to judge rightly of an Act, whether it be valuable or not, in point of Religion, and whether it carrieth with it a Divine Authority, it is absolutely necessary to apply to it the two Rules that have been above mentioned. *S. Augustin's* Advice is, when any such Difficulties arise, (c) to have regard to the plurality of Churches, and to prefer those that are in a greater number and of more eminent note, before the others that are in a lesser number and less considerable.

There is another sort of Acts attributed to the Apostles or their Disciples, that have been rejected as Apocryphal in process of time, though in the beginning they did really belong to those to whom they were ascribed, or at least to their Disciples who had published them under the name of their Masters. But these Acts having been interpolated and mangled by the Hereticks, or else by others, we have been obliged not to allow them any longer as authentick. *St. Epiphanius* seems to have put in this rank the Book called *Διδασκαλίας τῶν Ἀποστόλων*, the *Constitution of the Apostles*, which he often quotes, as if it were indeed theirs. He draws from thence Proofs to confirm the judgment of the Church, when he examines the opinion of the *Audians* concerning the *Passover*, who produced one of these Constitutions, attributing it to the Apostles. This Father being very far from condemning, or even doubting of it, received it with them as Apostolical, reproving them only for taking it in a wrong sense. And whereas these Constitutions were from that time suspected by some, he adds that they ought not to be rejected for this, because they contained the whole Ecclesiastical Discipline; which

(b) 'Εν τοῖς περὶ ἐξουσιῶν ἱμῶν τέσσασιν εὐαγγελίοις ἢ ἐξ αὐτῶν τὸ ῥητὸν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους. Clem. Alex. lib. 3. Strom.

(c) Tenebis hunc modum in Scripturis Canonicis, ut eas que ab omnibus accipiuntur Ecclesiis Catholicis, præponat eis quas quedam non accipiunt. In eis verd que non accipiuntur ab omnibus, præponat eas quas plures gravioreſque accipiunt, eis quas pauciores minorisq̃ue autoritatis Ecclesie tenent. Aug. lib. 2. de Doctr. Christ. cap. 8.

makes me judge that he had another Copy different from that which we read at present. He appeared to be so well persuaded that these Constitutions were made by the *Apostles*, (d) that he calls them *the Word of God*. Nevertheless, it is more probable that the Apostles, who had received Orders from Jesus Christ to preach his Gospel, and not to compose Books, are not the Authors of these Constitutions that bear their Name. But as S. Mark calls his Gospel the Gospel of Jesus Christ, so in like manner Apostolical Men, who succeeded the Apostles, have collected their Doctrine and Constitutions, and published them under the Name of the Apostles. It is in this sense that the Apostles Creed is so called, being that ancient Confession of Faith that all the Churches undoubtedly received from the Apostles, though they had not committed it to Writing.

CHAP. IV.

The ancient Fathers have not produced the Originals of the New Testament in their Disputes against the Hereticks. An Examination of Proofs that are brought to shew that these Originals have been kept in some Churches.

WE may conclude from all that hath been above related, that the most ancient Fathers of the Church, when they designed to establish the truth of the Books of the New Testament, have not had recourse to any Originals that had been kept in the Apostolical Churches, but only to true and exact Copies of them, which being found the same in all these Churches, were in the place of the Originals themselves. On this depends all the Dispute of *Tertullian* against *Marcion*, and that of S. *Augustin* against *Faustus* a *Manichean* Sectary. These two Hereticks refused to acknowledge the Copies that were approved in the Catholick Church. *Tertullian* and S. *Augustin* did not oppose to them the Authority of any Original Pieces, but only the constant Tradition of the Churches. *Vides* (saith S. *Augustin* speaking to *Faustus*) *in hac re quid Ecclesie Catholicae valeat auctoritas?* Is it possible (may some say) that God hath given to his Church, Books to serve her for a Rule, and that he hath at the same time permitted that the first Originals of these

Aug. lib.
11. cont.
Faust. c. 2.

(d) Ἐν ταῖς διατάξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων φάσκει ὁ θεὸς λόγος. Epiph. Har. 80. n. 7.

Books should be lost ever since the beginning of the Christian Religion? There have been from the very first planting of the Church, Hereticks who have disputed against the Writings of the Apostles, and therefore it seems to behove the Divine Providence to preserve these Originals at least for some time, from whence these Hereticks might be solidly confuted.

But it hath been already made appear elsewhere, that it is no wonder that the Primitive Christians, who had not a regular Body of a State in which they lived, and whose Assemblies were on the contrary furiously disturbed by the *Jews* and *Pagans*, had lost the Originals of their Books. Besides, the Apostles had no order from Jesus Christ to write their Books, as hath been above observed: and although they should not have been written, Religion would be equally preserved by the means of Tradition, after the same manner as it had been established before the Apostles had committed any thing to Writing. *Quid si* (saith St. Irenæus) *neg. Apostoli quidem Scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant Ecclesias?* Upon the whole matter, Jesus Christ had sent his Apostles to all the Nations of the Earth, only to preach his Doctrine to them. That which the ancient Christians have called Gospel, is only a Collection of the Preachings of these same Apostles, or of their Disciples.

As for what relates to the Primitive Hereticks, they would not have been more solidly confuted by opposing to them the Originals of the Writings of the Apostles, since they took the liberty to reform their Doctrine, and to set up in opposition to their Books I know not what Traditions, of which they themselves were the Authors; as may be seen more at large in the Books of S. Irenæus, who understood perfectly well the Opinions of these ancient Sectaries, of which he hath left us some Records. He declares, for example, in speaking of the *Gnosticks*, that he had to do with Persons that did not acknowledge the Scriptures, nor the Tradition of the Church, but that squared both the one and the other according to the measure of their own Prejudices; therefore he forgets nothing that may serve to establish the true Traditions by which Religion ought to be regulated.

Although the Scriptures are a sure Rule on which our Faith is founded, yet this Rule is not altogether sufficient of it self; it is necessary to know, besides this, what are the Apostolical Traditions; and we cannot learn them but from the Apostolical Churches, who have preserved the true Sense of Scriptures. S. Irenæus adviseth, (a) that

*Rep. à la
Défense
des Sent.
de quelq.
Theol. de
Holl. ch. 6.
pag. 179.*

*Iren. l. 3.
adv. Her.
c. 4.*

*Iren. adv.
Her. lib. 3.
cap. 2.*

(a) that the sacred Books should be read, to be informed from thence of Religion: but at the same time he adviseth, that they should be read with those who being the Successors of the Apostles, have been as it were the Depositories or Stewards of their Doctrine. There was no talk in those days of reading the Holy Scriptures in the Originals; any Copy whatsoever, provided it were used in the Orthodox Churches, might be relied on, as if it had been the first Original written with the hand of the Apostles. We ought to give the same credit to Copies that have been made of the Apostolical Writings, as to the very Originals, because these Copies have been taken from thence even from the times of the Apostles, and have been afterwards dispersed almost throughout the whole Earth: they have been preserved in all the Churches of the World, having been translated into divers Languages; insomuch, that there is no Book the Copies whereof are more authentick than those of the New Testament: and in this we ought chiefly to acknowledge the peculiar Providence of God in the preservation of these Books that he hath given to his Church by the Ministry of the Apostles, or of their Disciples.

Some pretend nevertheless to make it appear by actual Proofs taken out of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, that the original Writings of the Apostles have been preserved in the Church during several Ages: and this must be examined in particular, though I have already discoursed thereof elsewhere. In the first place they produce a Passage of *Tertullian* in his Book of Prescription against Heresies, where he saith, in speaking of the Churches that had been founded by the Apostles, (b) that they yet kept in his time their Authentick Writings. *Pamelius*, in his Notes on this Passage, affirms after another Author, that the Word *Authentick* cannot be taken but for the Originals that had been written with the very hand of the Apostles themselves; after the same manner as Lawyers call a Testament *Authentick* that hath been written with the hand of the Testator, to distinguish it from a Copy. This is also the Sense that *Grotius*, *Walton*, *Huetius*, and many others, have given of these Words of *Tertullian*. *Tertullianus* (saith *Grotius*) *aliquot librorum ipsa Archetypa suo adhuc tempore ait extitisse*. He avoucheth, from this

Pamel.
Annot. in
lib. Tertul.
de Præscr.
c. 36.

Grot. de
Verit. Re-
lig. Christ.
lib. 3.

(a) *Omnis sermo et constabit, si Scripturam diligenter legerit apud eos qui in Ecclesia sunt Presbyteri, apud quos est Apostolica doctrina.* *Iren.* lib. 4. adv. Hær. cap. 51.

(b) *Apud quos ipsæ Authentice Literæ eorum recitantur.* *Tertull. de Præscr.* cap. 36.

place of *Tertullian*, (c) that some Originals of the New Testament have been preserved till the beginning of the third Century.

But if we carefully examine the different Passages wherein *Tertullian* makes use of the Word *Authentick* in his Works, we shall find that he hath meant nothing else by this Expression than Books written in their Original Languages. This is what *Rigaltius* hath very well observed on this Sentence of *Tertullian*, where explaining the Word *Authenticæ*, he saith, *Lingua scilicet eadem qua fuerant ab Apostolis conscriptæ sonantes vocem uniuscujusque. Sic ipse lib. de Monogamia, ad Græcum authenticum Pauli provocat.* Whereas the Latin Version of the New Testament was only read in the Churches of *Africa*, he gives the Name of *Authentick* to the *Greek* Text: and in this Sense it is that quoting this Text in his Book of *Monogamy*, he saith, *Sciamus planè non esse sic in Græco authenticum.* *St. Jerom* also useth the like Expression with respect to the Old Testament, when he opposeth the *Hebrew* Text to the *Greek* and *Latin* Versions; for he calls the former *Veritatem Hebraicam*, the *Hebrew* Verity; designing thereby to denote the Originals of the Scriptures which he likewise denominates as *Tertullian* doth, *Authenticos libros*, in his Commentary on *chap. 64.* of the Prophet *Isaiah*: nevertheless he did not believe that these were the first Originals written with the hand of the Prophets. We express our selves also at this day after the same manner, when we say that a Version of the Scriptures is not conformable to the Original. *Tertullian* therefore doth not speak of any other Originals in his Book of *Prescription*, than those that we have just now remarked. As to the Authority of Lawyers that *Pamelius* opposeth, it is easie to remonstrate by the Testimony even of the most learned Lawyers, that the Word *Authentick* is often taken in a less strict sense. Every Act that proves and procures credit of it self, whether it be an Original or not, is accounted *Authentick*. An Author that publisheth some Manuscript Piece, assures us that it is taken *ex codice authentico*, from an *authentick* Copy; Doth he mean by this that he hath the Original of the Book that he sets forth, in his own hands?

In the second place they offer an actual Proof taken from *Eusebius*. This Historian speaking of the Zeal and of the Charity of the ancient Christians, who went to preach the Gospel to the most remote Nations, after the Example of the Apostles, saith that *Pantenus* quitted the City of *Alexandria*, where he was the Principal of a School or Colledge of Christians, to promulge the Religion

Rigalt. Annot. in lib. Tertul. de Prescr. c. 36.

Tertul. lib. de Monog. c. 11.

Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 10.

(c) *Archetypa nonnulla ad annum usque ducentessimum servata sunt.* Grot. de Verit. Relig. Christ. lib. 3.

of Jesus Christ to the *Indians*. This faithful Evangelist being among the *Indians* or *Ethiopians*, found there a Copy of *S. Matthew's* Gospel, written in *Hebrew*, that *S. Bartholomew*, the Apostle of these People, had left, and was believed to be preserved there to that time.

But besides that, *Eusebius* doth not confirm this History by any Ecclesiastical Writer, being content only to say that it was a common Report, *ἀκούω*. I do not see that it can be unquestionably proved from these Words, that the *Hebrew* Copy that *Pantenus* found at his Arrival in that Country, was the Original that *St. Bartholomew* had left there. He only intended to say, That the *Ethiopians*, who had been converted to the Faith of Jesus Christ by this Apostle, did not make use of the *Greek* Gospel of *S. Matthew*, but of the *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick* that had been written for the first Christians of *Jerusalem*. If this History were true, the Primitive Christians of *Ethiopia* were descended from the *Jews*, and spake the same Language as those that inhabited *Judea*. This is all that can be concluded from the Discourse of *Eusebius*, which hath been amplified in process of time. *St. Hierom* doth not seem to have understood the sense of this Historian, when he saith in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, that *Pantenus* (d) returning to *Alexandria*, carried back with him the Gospel of *St. Matthew* written in *Hebrew* Characters. *Eusebius* saith only, that the Christians of *Ethiopia* had preserved this *Hebrew* Gospel until the Arrival of *Pantenus*.

The third material proof that is brought is taken from the Chronicle of *Alexandria*, wherein it is observed, that a correct Book of the Gospel of *St. John*, that had been written with that Evangelist's own hand, was preserved in the Church of *Ephesus*. *Peter* Bishop of *Alexandria* maintained that it ought to be read in the xix Chap. of *S. John*, ver. 4. *ὥρα ὡς ὅτε τρίτη*, it was about the third hour, (e) because (saith he) this reading is found in the correct Copies, and in that which had been written with *St. John* the Evangelist's own hand; which Copy is kept at present, by the Grace of God, in the most holy Church of *Ephesus*, and is there adored by the Faithful.

It is no difficult matter to judge that all that was said in that time at *Ephesus* concerning the Original Writing of *St. John*, who had been Bishop of that City, was only grounded on a popular Er-

(d) Quod Hebraicis literis scriptum revertens Alexandriam secum detulit. Hier. de Scrip'tor. Eccles. in Panteno.

(e) Καθὼς τὰ ἀκριβῆ βιβλία φέρει αὐτότε τὸ ἰδιόχειρον τῶ εὐαγγελιστῆ Ἰωάννη, ὅσο μὲχρι νῦν πρὸς τὴν χάριν τῶ Θεοῦ ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλῆσιᾳ ἀριστάτῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ ὡς πρὸς τῶ πρῶτον ἐκείνου ἀποστολικῆς. Chron. Alex. edit. Monachii, p. 521.

ror; several like instances whereof it were easie to produce. Can we see any thing more ridiculous than the Tradition of the *Venetians* with respect to the Gospel of *St. Mark*, the Original of which, written with his own hand, they pretend yet to keep even to this very day? *Baronius* could not forbear rejecting this Tradition, as having no foundation in Antiquity. *Fertur traditione magis* (saith this learned Annalist) *quàm antiquorum certo testimonio, ipsum Marcum, Evangelium suum quod Romæ Latine scripserat, cum Aquilejæ moraretur, missus illuc à Petro ad eam erigendam Ecclesiam, in Græcum transfuisse, ipsumque Originale diutius asservatum Venetias demum esse transfatum.* *Fabiano Justiniani*, a Priest of the Oratory of Rome, who hath believed with *Lucas Brugensis*, that the *Latin* Gospel of *St. Mark* which we have, hath been translated from the *Greek*, doth not stick to declare (f) to us the common belief of the People of the State of *Venice*, who shew the very Original of *St. Mark* written in *Greek*, and even the Ivory Chair wherein he had written it. It is not necessary to confute this sort of vulgar Traditions, that are grounded on no Acts, as *Baronius* himself hath acknowledged.

The same thing may be said concerning the Tradition of thole of *Epheſus* related by *Peter* Bishop of *Alexandria*: we might demand of him who are the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers that have made mention before him, of this Gospel written with *St. John's* hand? It is requisite that they should explain to us after what manner, and through what Channel this original Piece is conveyed down to this time without having any knowledge thereof in the preceding Ages. If *St. Epiphanius* had heard any News of this Original, he would not have failed to refer the *Alogians* to it, who generally rejected all the Books of *St. John*, which they ascribed to the Heretick *Cerinthus*: on the contrary, he only opposeth to them good Reasons; and being very far from disputing with them on a vain Tradition that had no grounds but the simplicity of the People, (g) he saith, if they had only disallowed the Apocalypse, it might be thought that a certain too curious criticizing Humor had obliged them to embrace this Opinion, not to receive an Apocryphal Book, because there are some things in this Book profound and obscure.

(f) *Marcus cum in Aquilejam Venetæ Provinciæ civitatem à Sancto Petro missus venisset, ibi idem Evangelium iterum Græco eloquio exaravit, quod usque hodie in Aquilejensi Ecclesiâ cum eburneâ sede, in quâ illud scripserat, ostenditur, & congruâ devotione reservari dicitur.* *Fabian. Justin. Comm. de Sacr. Script. lib. 1. part. 2. c. 48. edit. Romæ, ann. 1614.*

(g) *Εἰ δὲ ἐνέχοντο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, πλὴν δὲ ἀποκαλύψαι ἀπὸ ἀλλοῦ, ἐλέγξαν αὐτὸν μὴ πρὶν ἀπὸ ἀκριβοῦς λόγου τὸ ποιεῖν, ἀποκρυπτον μὴ διακρυφῶσι διὰ τὰ ἐν τῷ ἀποκαλύψει βαθέως καὶ οὐκ ἐνηγῶς εἰρημολογία.* *Epiph. Hær. 51. n. 3.*

Lastly, they oppose that which happened under the Emperor *Zeno* in the Isle of *Cyprus*, where *Anthimus* Bishop and Metropolitan of this Island, was advertised in a dream of the ground-plot where the Body of *St. Barnabas* had been enterred, which was found accordingly in the place that had been revealed to him, having on his Breast the Gospel of *St. Matthew* written with his own hand. This Copy was immediately sent to the Emperor, who received it with a profound respect, and kept it as a precious Relick in a Church that was in his Palace. The Church of *Constantinople* read the Gospel once every Year in this venerable and august Copy of *St. Barnabas*. To render this Story more probable, they add the Testimony of Cardinal *Baronius*, who averreth that we cannot doubt thereof, it being generally received of all the World; besides that it hath been written by an Orthodox Monk named *Alexander*, who lived in that time.

It cannot be denied indeed, but that a great number of *Greek* Historians, one after another, have related the matter of fact, as is above said. *Theodorus Lector* (h) doth even specify the name of the Tree under which the Body of *St. Barnabas* was found who had on his Breast the Gospel of *St. Matthew*: *Nicephorus*, *Cedrenus*, *Joel*, *Nilus Doxapatrius*, and some other *Greek* Writers, have also made mention of this Gospel of *St. Matthew* written with the hand of *St. Barnabas*; but they do not tell us whether it were *Hebrew* or *Greek*; which is the thing that deserves to be most enquired into in all this Affair, and whereon entirely depends the Discovery of the Vision of *Anthimus* to whom *St. Barnabas* appeared: this is observed by all the *Greek* Historians, with the Monk *Alexander*, that they of the Isle of *Cyprus* took occasion from thence to shake off the Yoke of the Patriarch of *Antioch*, who pretended that they were of his dependence. This was an old Quarrel between this Patriarch and the Bishops of this Island, who refused to take Ordination of him, because their Church having been founded by the Apostle *St. Barnabas*, ought to be (as they thought) independent. This Affair had been decided in the Council of *Ephesus* in favour of the Bishops of this Isle, who had represented that they had enjoyed this Privilege time out of mind. Notwithstanding, the Patriarchs of *Antioch* continued to molest the Bishops of *Cyprus*, and justified their Proceedings with the Canon of the Council of *Nice*, that was favourable to them. It is also very probable, that they of *Cyprus* did

(h) Βαρνάβα τῷ ἀποστόλῳ τὸ ληψάνον εὐρέσθαι ἐν Κύπρῳ ὑπὸ δένδρῳ κατέστιον ἔχον ἐπὶ στήθους τὸ καὶ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον ἰδιόγραφον τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ. Theodor. Lect. Collect. lib. 2.

not withdraw themselves from the Jurisdiction of *Antioch* till this Patriarchal Church fell into Schism. *Anthimius*, Metropolitan of *Constance*, took an occasion at that time, in regard that *Petrus Fullo* who was then Patriarch of *Antioch*, had declared himself Protector of the *Eutychians*. But since the whole matter was of necessity to be referred to the Emperour, the Metropolitan of *Constance*, who was not in his favour, thought fit to feign the Vision above mentioned. Which being come to the knowledge of *Zeno*, he forthwith forbad the Patriarch of *Antioch* for the future to disturb the Bishops of *Cyprus*. *Anthimio Constantiensi Episcopo*, (saith Father *Morin*, who epitomized the History of Monk *Alexander*) *ed quod apud Imperatorem minime gratus esset fluctuanti; & apud maxime dormitanti apparet S. Barnabas, qui corporis sui reliquias, & S. Matthæi Evangelium, quod ipse descripserat, ei indigitar, atque Apostolum fidei auctorem se in patria habere ut adversarius repenat, præcipit.*

This is in a few words the discovery of this Vision of Bishop *Anthimius*, who very opportunely caused *St. Barnabas* to appear *tantum Deum è Machina* to oppose *Petrus Fullo* Patriarch of *Antioch*: and that there might not remain any doubt of his Revelation, he put into the hands of *St. Barnabas* the Gospel of *St. Matthew*. Mr. *le Moine*, a learned Protestant, and well versed in the Oriental Languages, assures us that it was written in *Hebrew*, because *St. Barnabas* who had transcribed it for his own use, was born a *Jew*, and preached to those of his Nation. But it is more likely that *Anthimius*, who was not a *Jew*, should forge a Greek one; neither is it credible that it should have been publicly read in the Church of *Constantinople*, if it had been written in *Hebrew*. As for the deference that *Baronius* gives to the Testimony of the Monk *Alexander*, Author of the Life of *St. Barnabas*, this Cardinal is not very favourable to the said Monk in another part of his Annals, where (i) he speaks of him as an Inventor of Tales, that hath not written the Life of this Holy Apostle as an Historian.

I could bring other Examples of the like Revelations, that have as many Circumstances as that of Bishop *Anthimius*, and yet for all this are never the more true. Under the Reign of the Emperor *Theodosius* a Revelation was feigned to authorize the false *Apocalypse* that was attributed to *S. Paul*. It was also found under ground at *Tarsus* in *Cicilia*, in the House of this Holy Apostle. There were also a great number of *Alexanders* or *Monks* in *Palestine* that every where extolled this false Piece, as if it had truly belonged to him

(i) *Alexander Græcus auctor, qui res Barnabæ profectus est encomiasticè, potius quam historicè, &c. Baron. ann. ch. 51. n. 53.*

Mr. le
Moine
Prod. in
var. opusc.
Gr.

whole

Soz. Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 19. whose Title it bore. But *Sozomon*, who relates this History, informs us at the same time, that a Priest of the City of *Tarsus*, who was a very old man, had assured him that this was false.

Furthermore, we do not find that the two greatest men of the Church, I mean *Origen* and *St. Hierom*, who have searched the ancient Copies of the Scriptures with so much care and diligence, and have visited so many Churches in the East, have ever spoken of Originals of the New Testament written with the hand of the Apostles; which they would not have failed to do if there had been any in their times; especially *St. Hierom*, who consulted a very great number of Greek and Latin Copies, when by order of Pope *Damasus*, he revised the ancient Latin Version of the Gospels. Where were then these pretended Originals? It is true there was no talk as yet of the Revelation of *Anthimus*, nor of the History of Monk *Alexander*. This Father hath said well, that the Latin Copies were all different one from another: *Tot enim sunt exemplaria penè, quot codices.* Therefore (k) he judges it necessary in this great diversity of Copies, to have recourse to the Original Greek from whence the Latin hath been taken: but he makes no mention of these first Originals, that Mr. *Huet* supposeth (l) to have been kept in the Archives of the Churches since the time of *St. Ignatius*, by which (saith this learned man) they were regulated in their Controversies and Disputes. The Jesuit *Maldonat*, on the contrary, proves by the same Passage of *St. Ignatius*, (m) that in these Primitive Apostolical times there were People who doubted of the truth of the Gospels, at least if they could not find them in the Archives of the Church. To conclude, *Tertullian* and *St. Augustin*, who have so vigorously disputed with the ancient Hereticks that destroyed the Verity of the Writings of the Apostles, have never objected these Originals to them: so that this is by no means necessary for the establishing of the Christian Religion, as hath been above shewed.

(k) Hoc certe cum in nostro sermone discordat, & in diversos rivulorum trames uno de fonte quarendum est. Hieron. Præf. in Evang. ad Damas.

(l) Ex fide primigeniorum illorum exemplarium quæ servabantur in Ecclesiarum tabulariis, dirimebantur controversiæ, & hesitantiùm dubitatio tollebatur. D. Huet. in Demonst. Evang. pag. 642. primæ edit.

(m) Illis primis temporibus, ut ait Ignatius, nonnulli erant qui adeo suspecta haberent omnia, ut negarent se Evangelio, nisi in Ecclesiæ archivis invenirent, credituros. Maldon. Præf. in Evang. cap. 2.

CHAP. V.

Of the Books of the New Testament in particular, and first of the Gospel of S. Matthew. The Original of this Gospel hath been written in the Hebrew Tongue which the Jews of Jerusalem spake at that time. An Answer to the Reasons that are contrary to this Opinion.

IT is a constant Tradition founded on the general consent of all the Churches in the World, that there are but four Gospels, the first of which is that of S. Matthew: *Neque autem plura numero* Iren. l. 3. *quàm hæc sunt* (saith S. Irenæus) *neque rursus pauciora capit esse.* adv. Her. l. 11. Nevertheless there are found in these later times some Authors who have believed that S. Matthew is not the first that hath committed the Gospel of Jesus Christ to Writing. They ground their Opinion on this, that S. Luke seems to accuse those of little care and exactness that had published Gospels before him: and since this Accusation cannot fall on any of the three other Evangelists, they conclude from thence that none of them had written before. But we ought not to oppose an Inference that at most carries with it but a probability, to the Testimony of all Antiquity. Therefore Grotius (a) rejects this Opinion as being contrary to the order of the four Gospels established at all times among all Nations, and authorised by the most ancient Fathers. Maldonat who attributes this Argument to Beza, refutes it also with no other Reasons than that of Tradition; and adds at the same time that (b) if we should refer our selves herein to Hereticks, we should have no certainty in point of Religion. Luc. i. 1.

It cannot be denied also, at least without contradicting all Antiquity, but that S. Matthew hath written his Gospel in Hebrew, that is to say, in the Language that the Jews of Jerusalem then spake, that was called Hebrew, and was either Chaldaick or Syriack. (c) Papias, who lived with the Disciples of the Apostles, avoucheth this in

(a) *Refragatur vetustissimus librorum ordo apud omnes nationes, refragatur traditio vetus Irenæo Tertuliano testibus suffulta.* Grot. Annot. in c. 1. Luc. v. 1.

(b) *Si hereticis crederemus, nihil in ipsa etiam Religione certum stabileque haberemus.* Maldon. Præf. in Evang. c. 4.

(c) Ματθαῖος ἑβραϊστὴς τὰ λόγια συνέγραψατο. Pap. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 39.

express terms; and S. Irenæus, Origen and many other Fathers have afterwards confirmed it. S. Irenæus saith (d) that S. Matthew being among the Hebrews, composed his Gospel in their proper Dialect. Origen in the Canon that he hath given us of the Sacred Books, names S. Matthew the first of the Evangelists (e) who published it in Hebrew for the use of the Jews that had embraced the Christian Religion. These primitive Christians were called Nazarenes by the Jews, as appears from [the] Acts of the Apostles, where they accuse S. Paul of being the Ringleader of the Sect of the Nazarenes, *ἡγετοῦντων τῆς ἑκείνης Ναζωραίων αἵρεσις*. Ever since that time they have always given to the Christians the name of Nazarenes, which is found in their Talmud, and in their other Books. There were afterwards certain Sectaries under this same name, who adopted this Hebrew Gospel of S. Matthew, some Fragments of which are yet extant to this day, whereof we shall discourse hereafter. It is expedient before we proceed any further, to examine the Reasons of those that affirm that S. Matthew hath not composed his Gospel in Hebrew.

A. D. xxiv.

5.

Jacob.
Lop. Scum.
Annot. in
Eras.

Erasmus, who had no knowledge of the Hebrew Tongue, hath been one of the first that hath thereupon opposed the common sentiments of all Antiquity: but the Reasons that he produceth are so weak, that he sometimes makes himself even ridiculous, when he would talk like a Critick concerning a matter of which he was altogether ignorant. He would refer in every thing that relates to the Hebrew Tongue, to Oecolampadius who understood it no more than himself, which caused him to fall into gross Errors, and gave occasion to his Adversaries, especially Stunica a Learned Spaniard to reprehend his Ignorance. Cardinal Cajetan who was skilled neither in Hebrew nor Greek, hath blindly followed the mistakes of Erasmus in this point, as not being capable of correcting them. But the greatest part of the Catholics have herein abandoned Cajetan, that they might not without reason and judgment withstand a Tradition established on good Acts. Some Protestants on the contrary, who feared lest they should not have the true Gospel of S. Matthew, if it were evident that it had been written in Hebrew or Chaldaick, and lest the Greek that remains to us should be only a Translation, have readily embraced the Opinion of Erasmus and Cajetan. Flacius Illyricus hath diligently enough collected the Reasons that may be alledged in de-

(d) Ὁ μὲν δὲ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς ἑβραϊοῖς τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γεγραμὸν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγέλιον. Iren apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 5. cap. 8.

(e) Ἐκδεδωκέναι αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίου μετέσταντο γεγραμμένον ἑβραϊκοῖς συντάγμασιν. Orig. apud Euseb. lib. 6. Hist. Eccl. cap. 25.

fence thereof, and hath put them at the Head of his Edition of the New Testament, which he hath caused to be Printed in *Greek* and *Latin*. This we must now take into examination.

This famous Protestant objects in the first place, with *Cajetan*, *Matthias* several *Hebrew* Words that are explained in another Language in the Gospel of *S. Matthew*; as for example, *Eli, Eli, & lama sabactani*. *Flac. Illyr.* If *S. Matthew* (saith this Cardinal) had written his Gospel in *Hebrew*, it would not have been necessary for him to expound these Words in a different Idiom. But these Interpretations ought rather to be ascribed to the Translator than to the Author. To which he replys, that if this came from the Interpreter, he ought to have translated all the *Hebrew* of this Gospel, and not to have selected only some Words as he hath done. To which it may be answered, that it is the custom of the Interpreters of the Sacred Books, to let certain *Hebrew* Words remain in their Versions, which they think to have more energy or emphatic in them, and that cannot be always exactly translated. This is easie to be proved from the *Septuagint*, and other ancient *Greek* Interpreters of the Bible. *Grotius*, who hath also made this Objection in his Notes on *S. Matthew*, answers (f) that it is an ordinary thing for Writers, and also Interpreters to retain foreign Words that are remarkable, adding the Interpretation to them, and that this hath been sometimes practised by the *Septuagint*. *Præf. in Evang. Matth.*

Illyrius opposeth in the second place two Reasons of *Erasmus*; the first is, that none have avouched that they have seen this *Hebrew* Gospel, because that of which *S. Jerome* speaks, was the Gospel of the *Nazarenes*, which was written in *Syriack* or *Chaldaick*. The second consists in this, that the style of the Gospel of *S. Matthew* is like to that of *S. Mark*. From whence he concludes, that *S. Matthew* hath written in *Greek* as well as *S. Mark*.

S. Jerome himself answers to the first Reason, when he saith (g) that the most part of the ancient Doctors of the Church have believed that this *Hebrew* Gospel was the Original of *S. Matthew's*. Certainly it is the very same that this Apostle wrote for the primitive Christians of *Judea*, who then spake the *Chaldaick* Language.

Erasmus tells us, that he never heard of this matter, when he objects that the Gospel of the *Nazarenes* was not in *Hebrew*, but in *Chaldaick* or *Syriack*, not knowing that this *Chaldaick* or *Syriack* was

(f) Solenne est omnibus scriptoribus, etiam interpretibus, vocabula peregrina notabiliora servare integra, sed addito interpretamento. Quod aliquoties etiam factum videmus à Senibus Septuaginta. Grot. Annot. in tit. Matth.

(g) Vocatur à plerisque Matthæi authenticum. Hieron. Comm. in Cap. 12. Matth.

then called *Hebrew*. As for the Style this Reason is too general to be able to conclude any thing from thence. *Stunica* hath very well answered, (b) that it is not to be admired that the style of the Gospels appears to be the same in all the Evangelists, altho they had written in different Languages, because that being *Jews*, those among them that have written in *Greek* have very often kept the *Genius* and propriety of the *Hebrew* Tongue. This he proves by the example of *S. Luke*, who, tho he hath composed his Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles in more elegant *Greek* than that of the other Evangelists, doth not forbear to make use of divers Expressions that are purely *Hebrew*.

The third Objection is taken from *Calvin*, and is grounded on several Passages of the Old Testament, cited by *S. Matthew* according to the *Greek* Version of the *Septuagint*. Whence he infers, that *S. Matthew* hath composed his Gospel in *Greek*: otherwise writing for the use of the *Hebrews*, who read the Bible in *Hebrew*, he would have rehearsed these Passages after the same manner as they are in the *Hebrew* Text. But this reason is destructive of it self, because he that hath translated the *Hebrew* Gospel of *S. Matthew* into *Greek*, performing it for persons that spake *Greek*, and read the Bible in this Language, ought to quote the Authorities of the Old Testament, rather according to the *Greek* Version of the *Septuagint*, than according to the *Hebrew* Text which they understood not.

Illyricus adds to all these Reasons, that there is no likelihood that *S. Matthew* should design to write his Gospel in a Language that was no longer in use, because at that time all People, and even the *Jews* themselves spake *Greek* or *Chaldaick*: Besides that the Holy Ghost, who was the Author of these Books, knew that the Destruction of *Jerusalem* was not far off. Therefore there is no appearance (saith he) that he should intend to publish the Gospel in any other Language but the *Greek*, which was the Language of the Empire.

This Protestant is grossly mistaken, when he believes after *Erasmus*, that it is supposed that the Gospel of *S. Matthew* hath been written in the ancient *Hebrew*; whereas the *Hebrew* of the *Jews* at that time was the *Chaldaick* Language which they had brought with them from *Babylon*, and had only a little altered it. It hath indeed been

(h) Non hoc mirum videri debet, si loquendi idiomate omnes conveniant, etiamsi diversis linguis Evangelia conscripserint: erant enim ejusdem generis, hoc est *Hebraei* ex *Hebraeis*; & qui *Græcè* ex illis scripserunt, patriæ lingua proprietatem in *Græcâ* scripturâ sapissime referunt. *Jacob. Lop. Stun. init. Annotat. in Erasmi.*

more convenient that the Books of the New Testament should be written rather in *Greek* than in another Language. But here it is only argued concerning the *Jews* of *Palestine*, to whom *S. Matthew* first preached the Gospel. And since those People spake *Chaldaick*, it was necessary for him to preach to them in this same Language. On these grounds all Antiquity hath relied, when they have believed that *S. Matthew* had composed his Gospel in *Hebrew*.

He opposeth moreover, that *S. Matthew* saw that the *Jews* did daily harden their Hearts, and that they had an Abhorrence of the Religion of Jesus Christ. And therefore it is not credible (saith *Illyricus*) that this holy Apostle hath written his Gospel for their sake, and in their Language. But to what purpose are reasons drawn from expediency against matters of fact that are evident? We cannot doubt but many *Jews* of *Palestine* have received the Gospel of Jesus Christ by the Ministry of *S. Matthew*; and whereas they spake *Chaldaick* or *Syriack*, he could not leave this Gospel with them in Writing, but in the Language that was spoken by them. On this account we may judge of other the like reasons alledged by *Illyricus* to the same purpose. He pretends, for example, that Divine Providence would never have permitted the loss of so great a Treasure, if it were certain that the Gospel of *S. Matthew* had been written in *Hebrew*. He adds farther, that if *S. Hierom* had been truly persuaded that the *Hebrew* was the Original of this Gospel, he would rather have translated it than the *Greek*; now it cannot be said that he hath translated it from the *Hebrew* into *Greek*.

It is in vain that this Protestant calls the Providence of God to his assistance, in opposition to a fact that cannot be reasonably doubted of. The Fathers and the *Jews* themselves make no difficulty to acknowledge, that some Sacred Books have been lost: which nevertheless cannot be said of the Gospel of *S. Matthew*, since we have it in *Greek* in a state sufficiently perfect. The reason why the *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick* Copy is not preserved, is because the Churches of *Judea*, for whose use it was primarily written, have not long subsisted: On the contrary the Churches wherein the *Greek* Tongue flourished have always endured, and it is through the means of these last Churches that we have yet to this day the *Greek* Copy of *S. Matthew*.

This may serve also for an Answer to the Objection of *Chamierus*, *Chamier. Panstrat. lib. II. c. 8. n. 8.* who could not imagine how it could come to pass that there should have been so great a negligence in the Church in general, and in particular in that of *Jerusalem*, that the *Hebrew* Gospel of *S. Matthew* hath been lost from the first Ages of Christianity. Nevertheless it is very easie to be apprehended, if we consider that the Writings of the Apostles that were read in the Churches were preserved by the

means of the same: it is not therefore an extraordinary thing to see that the *Hebrew* Gospel of *S. Matthew* hath been lost in the loss of the Churches of the *Nazarenes*. It is in the mean time worth the observing, that it perished not entirely from the primitive times of Christianity; for the Sect of the *Nazarenes* who took their original from the first *Nazarenes* or Christians of *Judea*, continued for a long time to read it in their Assemblies. It passed also to the *Ebionites*, who altered it in some places: notwithstanding these Alterations, it might always be said, that this was the *Hebrew* Gospel of *S. Matthew*, especially if respect were had to the Copy of the *Nazarenes*, which was more pure than that of the *Ebionites*, and was still extant in the time of *S. Hierom*, who translated it into *Greek* and *Latin*. The other Christians neglected it, because besides their not understanding the Language in which it was written, they considered the *Nazarenes* as a sort of half Christians that still kept the Ceremonies of the Law; and they rejected the *Ebionites* as Hereticks.

Illyricus adds farther to all these Objections, that *S. Matthew* being a Publican, was either half a *Grecian* or a *Roman*; and that for this reason he ought rather to apply himself to write his Gospel in *Greek* for those of his Nation, than in *Hebrew* for the *Jews*. If this way of reasoning concluded any thing, it might be inferred from thence at the same time, that *S. John* who was an *Hebrew*, and whose Mother-Tongue was *Syriack* or *Chaldaick* should have composed his Gospel in this Language for those of his own Nations. It availeth nothing to oppose simple reasons of conveniency to manifest and clear matters of Fact. Neither is there any weight in a proof that he brings in the same place from certain *Latin* Words that are found in the Gospel of *S. Matthew*, which are more agreeable (as he thinks) to a *Greek* Author, than to a Man that writes in *Hebrew*, because the *Grecians* had more Intercourse with the *Latins*, than the *Hebrews*. But may it not be said that these *Latin* Words do rather belong to the *Greek* Translation, than to the original *Hebrew*? Besides, the *Jews* of those times who were under subjection to the *Romans*, might have adopted divers *Latin* Words into their Language. This same Principle may serve to resolve another Objection that he raiseth from the word *Petrus* which is in *S. Matthew*. If this Apostle (saith *Illyricus*) had written in *Hebrew* or *Syriack*, he would have made use of the Word *Cephas*, and not of that of *Petrus*: as if it might not be said that it is the *Greeks* Interpreter that hath inserted the Word *Petrus*. Lastly, he objects, that *S. Matthew* promizeth with too much liberty in *Chap. xii.* of his Gospel, a Passage of *Chap. 47.* of *Isaiab*: Which he would not have done (saith he) if he

he had written in *Hebrew*, because he would have produced the very Words of the Text. And it is not credible (adds he) that the Interpreter should be the Author of this Abbreviation. All this Argumentation that is grounded on no positive proof is nothing to the purpose. The Apostles on the contrary do often cite the Passages of the Old Testament only according to the sense, and they rehearse them sometimes in short, only producing that which relates to their design. *Wolzenius* a famous Unitarian hath also collected in the beginning of his Commentaries on the Gospels a part of these same Reasons, to shew that the Original of *S. Matthew* hath not been written in *Hebrew*; but he explains himself after such a manner as makes it appear that the *Fratres Poloni* have but little knowledge in facts that respect the Criticism of the Scriptures.

*J. Wolz.
Proleg. in
4. Evang.
cap. 9.*

I shall pass by in silence the Reflections of Dr. *Lightfoot* on this Subject, because they seem to me to be too Rabbinical, and even little intelligible. That which he adds in the same place, that the Gospel of *S. Matthew* hath not been immediately written in *Hebrew*, but in *Greek*, and that it hath been afterwards translated from the *Greek* into *Hebrew*, to the end that it might be read by the Learned *Jews*, is not supposed with any Foundation, all Antiquity having believed the contrary.

*J. Lightf.
Hor. Hebr.
in cap. 1.
Matth.*

There is not even at this day any Christian Society in the *Levant*, that is not persuaded that the *Greek Gospel of S. Matthew* is only a Version of the *Hebrew Text*. Therefore we find at the end of some *Greek Manuscript Copies* of this Gospel, that it hath been published by *Iscariotus*, at *Jerusalem*. We read also at the end of the *Syriack Version* of the same Gospel, that *S. Matthew* hath preached it in *Hebrew* in *Palestine*. Some Copies of the *Arabick Version* and the *Persian Translation* have also in the Title that is at the beginning of *S. Matthew*, that it hath been written in the *Hebrew Tongue*. This agrees perfectly with the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, whose Sentiments have been explained in a few words by *S. Jerome*: *Matthæus* (saith this Father). *Evangelium in Judæa Hebræo Sermonē edidit ob eorum maximè causam qui in Jesum crediderant ex Judæis*. All this makes it appear that *M. Vossius* hath had reason to call some Divines of his own Party who hold that *S. Matthew* hath not written in *Hebrew* (i) Demi-Theologues possessed with Rabbinism. He esteems them also so foolish, that he would not have them an-

*Nov. Test.
Syr. edit.
Vienne, &
in Bibl.
Polygl.*

*Hieron.
Præf.
Comm. in
Matth.*

(i) *Audio semi-Theologos quosdam Rabbinistas omnium Patrum omniumque Ecclesiasticorum testimonia conculcare, ac serio adfirmare Mattheum non Hebræicè, sed Græcè scripsisse. Stulti simus, si istiusmodi delirius aliquid resonamus. It. Voss. Præf. in Appen. ad lib. de LXX. Interp.*

swered.

swered. However I have thought that I ought not to neglect their Reasons, that have given me occasion to clear up this matter. And there are at this day very many persons, especially among the Protestants, that cannot yield to Mr. *Vossius*, who hath attacked them with Injuries and Reproaches rather than Arguments. The very Supposition it self that he makes, that the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* spake in the *Greek* Tongue amongst themselves, and that they made use of the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint in their Assemblies is a strong argument to prove that S. *Matthew* had indeed composed his Gospel in *Greek*. This obligeth me here to examine the Reasons on which Mr. *Vossius* grounds this Paradox, and to shew at the same time that the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* spake the *Chaldaick* or *Syriack* Language at the time of our Saviour and the Apostles.

CHAP. VI.

The Jews of the Territory of Jerusalem at the time of Jesus Christ and the Apostles spake in the Chaldaick or Syriack Tongue. An Answer to the Reasons that Mr. Vossius hath published against this Opinion. At the same time several Difficulties are cleared, appertaining to this Matter.

*If. Voss.
Resp. ad
iter. P.
Sim. Obj.
p. 375.
* Semi-
doctorum
& fanaticorum.*

IT is to be feared lest these Protestant Divines whom Mr. *Vossius* seems so much to despise should in their turn reprove him, because he overthrows all Tradition, and contradicts the Holy Scriptures themselves and all Learned Divines, when he avoucheth that in the time of Jesus Christ and the Apostles the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* spake no other Language but the *Greek*. In like manner he treats those persons * as half-learned and Fanaticks, that believe that Jesus Christ and his Disciples have spoken in the *Syriack* Tongue. At that rate all the World would be filled with half-learned and fanatical People, and Mr. *Vossius* alone would be truly learned and exempt from Fanaticism. *Cor solus habet, solus & ingenium.* The ancient Ecclesiastical Authors who have affirmed that S. *Matthew* hath written his Gospel in *Hebrew* would be all Fanaticks; for they declare that they have embraced this Opinion only because the
Jews

Jews of *Jerusalem* then spake *Hebrew*, that is to say, the *Chaldaick* or *Syriack* Tongue: and since they have confirmed this their Judgment by express Passages of the New Testament, I think it necessary here to produce some of them.

It is expressly said in the *Acts* of the Apostles, (a) that *St. Paul* made a discourse in *Hebrew* to the *Jews* of *Jerusalem*, (b) who heard of him because he spake their Language. This holy Apostle being of *Tarsus*, a City of *Cilicia*, where he had learn'd *Greek*, would not have fail'd to make an Oration to them in that Language, if it had been the vulgar Tongue of the *Jews* of *Jerusalem*. But because he was an *Hebrew*, and of *Hebrew* Parents, and had been educated in their City, studying under the Doctor *Gamaliel*, he spake to them in the Language that was understood by the People. It was for this reason also that the *Tribune* demanded of *S. Paul* whether he could speak *Greek*, *Græcè nosti*? He supposed that the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* spake in a different Tongue from the *Greek*, viz. the *Chaldaick* or *Syriack*, as appears manifestly from *S. Luke*, who saith (c) that the Field of *Judas* was called *Aceldama* in the Language that was then spoken at *Jerusalem*. Moreover, we find in the New Testament divers *Chaldaick* or *Syriack* Words, as for example, *Bethesda*, *Golgotha*, *Tabitha*, and some others that the Evangelists call *Hebrew*, according to the manner of speaking at that time. *St. John* making mention of the Fish-pond or Pool of *Jerusalem*, saith (d) that it was called in *Hebrew*, *Bethesda*; and in another place, that (e) *Gabbatha* and (f) *Golgotha* are *Hebrew* Words.

One would think, that after so many Testimonies of the New Testament, we could not doubt that the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* spake *Hebrew* in the times of the Apostles. In the mean time, *Mr. Vossius*, who hath openly declared against the *Hebrew* Text of the *Jews*, hath thought, that he could not give a greater Authority to the *Greek* Version of the *LXX*, than in making it appear that *Jesus Christ* and his Apostles had read it in the Temple and in the Synagogues of *Jerusalem*. But it was not necessary to cast himself into this extremity, and to argue against actual proofs of matter of fact that are indisputable, to defend the ancient *Greek* Translation against

(a) Περιπαύοντι τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ διαλέκτῳ. *Act.* 21. 40.

(b) Ἀκούοντες ὃ ὅτι τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ διαλέκτῳ περιπαύοντι αὐτοῖς. *Act.* 22. 1.

(c) Ὃτε κληθῆναι τὸ χωρίον ἐκείνο τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῆς, Ἀκeldαμά. *Act.* 1. 19.

(d) Κολυμβήθρα ἢ ἐπιλεγεμένη Ἑβραϊστὶ Βηθσαιδα. *Joann.* 5. 2.

(e) Εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Λιθόστρωτον, Ἑβραϊστὶ Γαββαθᾶ. *Joann.* 19. 13.

(f) Εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον κρανίον τόπον, ὃς λέγεται Ἑβραϊστὶ Γολγοθᾶ. *Ibid.* ver. 17.

some

some Protestants that had unhappily attacked it. He supposeth, to establish his Opinion, that (g) the *Greek* and *Latin* were the Languages in use throughout the whole Empire; and that the *Hebrew* was not understood even by the *Jews*. We willingly agree with him that the *Greek* and *Latin* were the Languages of the Empire; but this doth not prove that these two Languages only were spoken therein. There are on the contrary, positive Proofs in the New Testament confirmed by all Antiquity, that evidently shew that the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* then spake *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick*. We agree also with him, that the ancient *Hebrew* Tongue was not at that time a vulgar Language, and that none but the Priests understood it; but it cannot be concluded from thence that they spake *Greek*. *Josephus*, who was very well skilled in the *Greek* Tongue, (h) assures us, that it was foreign to him and to those of his Nation.

Mr. *Vossius*, to whom all these difficulties have been represented, cannot resolve them, but in supposing always, that (i) during the Subsistence of the *Roman* Empire, no other Language was spoken but the *Greek* in *Jerusalem* and in all *Palestina*. He would have the *Syriack* sought for without the Empire; this he proves by the Example of St. *Ephraem* and others Fathers that have written in this Language, and have all been of the *Partbian* or *Arabian* Nation; affirming that we must look for the *Syriack* Tongue amongst the *Assyrians* and the *Arabians* that inhabited the lower *Syria*, and not amongst the *Syrians* that were in the *Roman* Empire: and besides that, we ought not to call that *Syriack* which is called *Chaldaick* in the New Testament. He adds farther, that the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* could not learn the *Chaldaick* but of the *Jews*, that were on the other side of the River *Euphrates*: that it is madness to say that the said *Jews* of *Jerusalem* have kept this Language by Tradition in a place where the *Greek* hath been in use for many Ages; especially it being impossible to bring any Example that may make it appear that a Language can be preserved in a Country, when another hath obtained therein. He concludes at last, that the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* had no other vulgar Tongue in the time of our Saviour and the Apostles than the *Greek* and *Latin*; and that those who had some knowledge of the *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick*, had attained it after the

(g) In Imperio Romano Græcus sermo & Latinus omnibus erat in usu: Hebræa vero lingua ne ab ipsis quidem Judæis intelligebatur. Voss. Resp. ad Object. Theol. Leyd.

(h) Ὁμοῖός μοι ἔχει μέλλουσιν ἐξέσθαι πλεονόμιον μετένγκειν ὑπόθεσιν εἰς ἀλλοδαπὴν ἡμῶν καὶ ἑτέραν διαλέκτου ὧν ἴδμεν. Joseph. Præfat. Antiq. Jud.

(i) Stante Imperio Romano solus ibi regnabat Græcus sermo Græcè omnes scripsere. Græcè etiam loquebantur. Voss. Resp. ad iter. P. Sim. Obj.

same manner as we now learn the *Latin* at this day, or by the Commerce that they had with the *Jews* that were on the farther side of *Euphrates*, where the *Chaldaick* was spoken.

Here it would be requisite to follow Mr. *Vossius* step by step, who hath had no other design in all this long Discourse, than to confound and intricate the matter in hand, not being able to answer precisely to the Reasons that have been proposed to him. It may be observed in the first place, that the present Question is not concerning the ancient Fathers that have spoken *Syriack*, and have written Books in this same Language; but only relating to the *Jews*; and therefore the Examples that he produceth of St. *Ephraem* and some other Doctors of the Church, are nothing to the purpose; for we agree with him, that those that have inhabited the Country that is on the farther side of *Euphrates*, have spoken *Syriack*: it is agreed also, that the *Jews* of the *Parthian* or *Arabian* Nation, who depended not on the *Roman* Empire, spake the *Chaldaick* or *Babylonish* Language. And not to insist on Questions about names, we are willing also to call that Tongue *Chaldaick* rather than *Syriack*, which is called *Hebrew* in the New Testament, though the ancient Fathers have named it *Syriack*, and though it be properly neither *Chaldaick* nor *Syriack*, it being degenerated from the true *Chaldaick*. All that Mr. *Vossius* can conclude from his Supposition, is, that the *Jews* who were beyond *Euphrates* spake only *Chaldaick*, whereas the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* and of *Palestine*, at least the most polite of them, spake, besides the *Chaldaick* which their Fathers had brought from *Babylon*, the *Greek* Tongue, which was become vulgar in these places.

It is madness to say that St. *Paul*, when he made his Oration in *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick* in the presence of the *Jews* of *Jerusalem*, had only regard to those that were beyond *Euphrates*, and to those that had learn'd the *Chaldaick* Tongue of them. He directs his Words in general to all the *Jews* that were present: and it cannot be said that he had only Strangers for his Auditors. *Josephus* was of the number of the *Jews* of *Jerusalem*, and not of the *Parthian* or *Arabian* Nation: he declares in the mean time, that that which had hindered him from writing the Antiquities of his Nation so soon as he had intended it, was, that he found it difficult to express his mind in the *Greek* Tongue that was foreign to him. He saith in another place, that he was born an *Hebrew*, that he is of *Jerusalem*, and a Priest; and in this same Passage he calls the *Chaldaick* the Language of his Country. This makes it evident that the *Chaldaick* cannot be restrained to the *Jews* only that were on the other side of *Euphrates*, since *Josephus* was not of that Country. Both the one

H

and

*Joseph.
Præfat.
Antiq.
Jud.*

*Joseph.
Præfat.
lib. de
Bell. Jud.*

and the other sort spake in this Tongue, with this difference only, that those that dwelled in the Countries that were beyond *Euphrates*, spake nothing but *Chaldaick*; and those of *Jerusalem* could besides the *Chaldaick* speak the *Greek* Language that was dispersed through *Palestine*.

As to what Mr. *Vossius* objects, that it is impossible to shew that a Language hath been preserved in a Country, when another hath come in its place; I answer, that it is easie to give him satisfaction in this Point, without departing from the *Jews* of whom the Question is. The History of the Martyrdom of the seven Brethren related in the second Book of *Maccabees*, informs us that the *Jews* of that time spake *Greek* and *Hebrew*: the Mother and the Children answered in *Greek* to *Antiochus*, (k) whereas amongst themselves they spake the Language of the Country, which was *Chaldaick*: *Antiochus* having urged the Mother to exhort one of her Children to yield to that which he required, (l) she laughing the Tyrant to scorn spake to her Sons in *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick*, which was her proper Tongue.

This is a manifest Proof, that the *Greek* was the vulgar Tongue of the Country, and that the *Jews*, besides the *Greek*, had preserved the *Chaldaick* which they had brought from *Babylon*, and which they called the Language of the Nation. The *Jews* of *Jerusalem* have also retained it always, tho the *Greek* was the vulgar Tongue of *Palestine*. This is yet more apparently seen in another Example that hath been already opposed to Mr. *Vossius*, I mean the *Jews* of the *Spanish* Rite who dwell at *Constantinople* and in some other Cities of the *Levant*: these *Jews* do still keep their ancient *Spanish*, with the Language of the Countries which they inhabit; and they have also Translations of the Bible in *Spanish* for their use.

Mr. *Vossius* answers this Objection, that this might be in some manner true in the time of *Mariana*, because when this *Jesuit* wrote his History, it was not an Age since the *Jews* had been driven out of *Spain*. He adds farther, that the other Historians who have written at that very time speak quite otherwise, because the *Jews* (m) that were driven out of *Spain* and *Portugal* were all dispersed among the *Moors*; and finally, that he knows not what is meant by the *Spanish Jews* that were scatter'd in the *Levant*.

(k) Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀντὶ παραχρᾶς τῇ πατρὶ φωνῇ. II Maccab. 7. 22.

(l) Χλδαίου(α τὸν ὠμὸν πυγανόν, ἔπος ἔφησε τῇ πατρὶ φωνῇ. Ibid. v. 27.

(m) *Profugi ex Hispaniâ Lusitaniâque Judæi, si quis in fuga non periere, illi fere omnes per Maurorum dissipati fuere terras, ut nesciam omnino quosnam hic intelligat P. Simonius Hispanici generis Judæos, qui per Orientem fuere dispersi.* Voss. Resp. ad tert. P. Sim. Obj.

But it is in vain to argue against evident matters of fact that may be known by all the World. We have not made use of the Authority of *Mariana* to prove them, nor of any other Historian; but of the Books themselves of these *Spanish Jews* that have been printed at *Constantinople* in the *Spanish* Tongue, and in *Hebrew* Characters. We have their *Pentateuch* printed at that place not only in *Spanish*, but also in *Vulgar Greek*, with the *Hebrew* Text and the *Chaldaick* Paraphrase. It is to be seen by the first leaf of this Work, that there are two sorts of *Jews* in those Parts, some of which speak *Spanish*, and the others the *vulgar Greek*; and that these two Versions have been published for their use, that they might more easily understand the Scriptures. The *Hebrew* Bible of *Lombroso* which hath been printed at *Venice* with Grammatical Notes, wherein the difficult Words are explained in *Spanish*, is also very common in the *Levant* among these *Spanish Jews*. It is a matter of little moment to know whether the *Jews* that departed from *Spain* and *Portugal* retired amongst the *Moors* or elsewhere, since it is without doubt, that there are at this day *Jews* of the *Spanish* Rite in the *Levant*, who beside that of the Places where they reside, have still preserved their ancient *Spanish* Tongue. This is the ground of the present Dispute: and by this it is made appear, that it is not impossible that the *Jews* should retain their ancient Language where there is another that is vulgarly spoken. We see moreover, that the *Portugal* *Jews* of the *Spanish* Rite, who are settled at *Amsterdam*, do keep the *Portugal*, with the Language of the Country; and that their Rabbins do also preach in *Portugaise* in their Synagogue.

In 1547.

In 1639.

Furthermore, it is not true that all the *Jews* that were driven out of *Spain* and *Portugal* took refuge among the *Moors*: there were many that withdrew themselves into *Italy*, from whence some passed afterwards into the *Levant*. However it were, it is certain that there is at this day, in the *Turkish* Territories, a considerable number of *Jews*, who follow the *Spanish* Rite; and besides that of the Places where they remain, do speak their ancient *Spanish* Language. I believe also, that a Party of these *Jews* was in those Countries before those of their Nation were expelled out of *Spain* and *Portugal*.

Mr. *Vossius*, who cannot maintain his Paradoxes but with other Paradoxes, corrects the Passage of the *xxi.* Chap. of the *Acts*, where the Tribune demands of *St. Paul* whether he could speak *Greek*: He pretends that it must not be read with the Point of Interrogation, *Græcè scis?* as all People read it; but that it ought to be read and translated after this manner, *Græcè scis: Non ergo es iste Egyptius qui ante hos dies tumultum concitavit.* Thou canst speak *Greek*:

Act. xxi.
v. 37.

Voss. ibid.

Therefore thou art not that Egyptian which before these days made an Uprour, &c. But I see no reason to change the ordinary reading of the Greek Text and ancient Versions in this place; neither would he have ever thought of it, were it not that this Passage manifestly destroys his Opinion. It is true that according to the most exact Rules of Criticism, no regard ought to be had to Accents, Points, and Comma's: but it seems to me not to be permitted without good Reasons to alter the ordinary Readings of the Text, especially when it is supported by ancient Interpreters. It would be (might it be said) a strange sort of sottish Stupidity, that the Tribune, who heard St. Paul talking in Greek, should have demanded of him whether he could speak that Language: nevertheless, there is nothing extraordinary in all this Discourse. St. Paul finding himself oppressed by the People, demanded to speak with the Tribune, who asked him in his turn, Whether he could speak Greek? This implies a Supposition that all the Jews of Jerusalem did not speak in that Tongue. Mr. Vossius, who is rich in Fictions, is obliged to make good his fancy, to suppose that the Egyptian of whom mention is made in that place, was an Arab-Egyptian of that part of Egypt where Arabick was spoken. But to whatsoever side he turns, he will not be able to avoid that which is related in the same Chapter; to wit, that (n) St. Paul spake in Hebrew, that is to say, in Chaldaick, to all this multitude that thronged about him, and attentively hearkened to his Speech, because he spake to them in their own Language.

There is yet less of solid Reason in the Answer that he makes to that which hath been objected to him, that the Field of Judas was called *Haceldama*, according to the vulgar Language of Jerusalem, which was consequently Chaldaick or Syriack, since this Word is Chaldaick. Who knows not (saith he) that the Jews do yet at this day give Hebrew Names to their Fields, Burying-places, and divers other things? I confess it; but it is said expressly in the Acts, (o) that this Field was called *Haceldama* in the Language that was spoken at Jerusalem.

It hath been also objected to him, that there can be no reason alledged why the Title of the Cross hath been written in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, unless it were that these three Languages were then spoken in Jerusalem. Now the Hebrew or Chaldaick was the

(n) Ὁ Παῦλος ἐπεὶ δὴ ἦν ἀνακαθμῶν κατέσκητο τῇ χειρὶ τοῦ λαοῦ πολλῆς ὃ σὺν ἡτοιμασμένῃ, περιεφώνησε τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ. Act. 21. 40.

(o) Τὸ γινώσκον ἐχρητο πάσι τοῖς κοίτοις ἱεροσολίμῳ, ὅτε κληθῆναι τὸ χειρίον αὐτοῦ τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτοῦ, Ἀκαλδαμα. Act. 1. 19.

Language of that place. Although it should be granted that there were also then at *Jerusalem* some *Jews* that came from beyond *Euphrates*; yet he will never persuade People endued with common Sense that respect was had only to this last sort of *Jews*, when this Title was written. It ought to have been written, for the same reason, in the Languages of the other *Jews* that were also present at that time at *Jerusalem*.

It hath been represented to Mr. *Vossius*, that the *Jews* of *Palestine* did understand even in the time of St. *Jerom* the *Chaldaick* Tongue, which their Ancestors had brought from *Babylon*. He demands what Proofs there are of this, and in what place of St. *Jerom* this is to be found? Nevertheless, he accounts as nothing the Testimony of this Father in his Preface to *Tobit*; wherein he saith, (p) that in translating this Book from *Chaldaick* into *Latin*, he was assisted by a *Jew*, who spake *Hebrew* and *Chaldaick* very well; and that he had put into *Latin* whatsoever he had expressed to him in *Hebrew* terms. This *Jew* spake *Hebrew* because he was a Man of great Learning; and he spake *Chaldaick* also, because it was the Language that the *Jews* of those Places yet spake amongst themselves, and in which they wrote their Books. For this reason the *Talmud* of *Jerusalem* hath been written in this Tongue, as well as that of *Babylon*. The same hath happened to the *Massora*, which hath been composed in *Chaldaick* by the *Jews* of *Tiberias*. The *Chaldaick* Tongue hath not been truly spoken in those Countries for many Ages since: but we must not confound the other people with the *Jews*, who had always continued to speak amongst themselves in the Language that they had received from their Fathers.

We shall not need then to have recourse to the *Parthians*, with Mr. *Vossius*, to introduce into those Places the *Chaldaick* or *Babylonian* Tongue in the time of St. *Jerom*, no more than in the time of the Apostles; but according to the custom that the *Jews* have to preserve their ancient Languages, though they are not spoken in the Countries where they have their abode, as we have proved by the Example of the *Spanish Jews*, who are in the *Levant*, and of those that are at present at *Amsterdam*. These last write Books in *Spanish* and *Portugaise*, although they be in a Country where the *Flemish* Tongue is spoken: they have also translated, for the use

(p) Quia vicina est Chaldaeorum lingua sermoni Hebraico, utriusque linguae peritissimum loquacem reperiens, unius diei laborem arripui; & quicquid ille mihi Hebraicis verbis expressit, hoc ego & accito notario sermonibus Latinis exposui. Hieron. Præf. in Tob.

of the People, out of *Hebrew* into *Spanish*, their Book of Prayers called *Seder tephiloth* under the Title of *Orden de Oraciones*.

Furthermore, not to enter into a fruitless Dispute purely about Words, Mr. *Vossius* shall be left to his liberty to call the Language that is stiled *Hebrew* in the Books of the New Testament, *Chaldaick* rather than *Syriack*. It is in vain then that he enlargeth so much on this Controversie of Words, and that he is so angry with several learned Men for having called it *Syriack* or *Syra Chaldaick*. (q) This Language (saith he) is not to be found but in the Writings of modern Authors who have forged these monstrous Words to wave the matter. But it seems to me that it hath been always permitted to any that would express something new, especially in point of Criticism, to invent new Words, that may give a clear and distinct Idea of the thing that is to be explained. Now it is certain that the Tongue which is named *Hebrew* in the New Testament, is properly neither *Hebrew* nor *Syriack*, nor even *Chaldaick*; for it is composed of a certain mixture of the *Hebrew* and of the *Chaldaick* or *Babylonian*. They that have used these Words, which are supposed to be barbarous, have been Persons very skilful in these Languages, and have discoursed of them with a perfect knowledge. When S. *Hieron* makes mention of the *Hebrew* Gospel of S. *Matthew* that was in use amongst the *Nazarenes*, he authorizeth the barbarous Word of *Syro-Chaldaick*, *quod Chaldaico*, (saith he) *Syroq, sermone, sed Hebraicis literis scriptum est*. Hence it may be observed, that this learned Father made no difficulty to call indifferently *Chaldaick* and *Syriack* the Language that the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* spake in the time of the Apostles. The greatest part of the Fathers, as well *Greek* as *Latin*, do also call *Syriack* that which bears the name of *Hebrew* in the New Testament. The most judicious Criticks of our Age speak no otherwise: Mr. *Vossius* alone is singular herein, who hath thought fit of late to reject this *Syriack* Tongue which he had already approved in his other Works. He demands in what time, and after what manner the *Hebrew* Tongue became *Syriack*? But as we have before said, he may, if he please, call it *Chaldaick*, if he remains so obstinate as not to be willing to receive the Name of *Syriack* with all Antiquity, and with the Suffrage of all People that are expert in these Languages, which he seems not to understand. If he rightly apprehended this matter, he would not insist on a Question that is only concerning a Name.

Hieron.
lib. 3. adv.
Pelag.

Voss. ibid.

(q) *Quæ tamen lingua nisi in scriptis forsan neotericorum, qui quando se expedire non possunt, istiusmodi fingunt voces, quas ipsa non capit rerum natura; nec accuratè se loqui existimarunt, nisi barbaris & monstrosis utantur appellationibus.*
Voss. Resp. ad tert. P. Sim. Obj.

To avoid all the trifling and insignificant Circumstances to which Mr. Vossius hath purposely had recourse, that he might make a shew of offering at least something in answer to the Objections that have been made to him, it is convenient that I should relate the Judgment as to this point of *George Amira*, a learned *Maronite*, who hath published at *Rome* an excellent Grammar of the *Syriack* Tongue: he hath intituled his Book, *A Syriack or Chaldaick Grammar*; and thus he makes it appear from the Title of his Work, that these two Words may be indifferently used: this he confirms at the same time by three Dissertations that are annexed at the beginning of this Grammar; for in the first he treats (r) of the Names of the *Chaldaick* and *Syriack* Tongue, and of the difference between them; in the second, (s) of the Antiquity of the *Chaldaick* or *Syriack* Tongue; and lastly, in the third, (t) of the Excellency of the *Chaldaick* or *Syriack* Tongue. Since this ingenious *Maronite* hath had a very clear notion of this matter, I shall produce the sum of what he saith concerning these two Languages in his preliminary Discourses.

*Georgii
Amiræ
Gramm.
Syr. sive
Chald.*

This Tongue whereof we now treat (saith *Amira*) hath been called *Chaldaick*, from *Chaldaea* where it hath been first in use, when the Confusion of Languages happened; therefore it hath been also named *Babylonian*, from *Babylon* the Capital City of *Chaldaea*: it was afterwards called *Aramean* or *Syriack*, from *Aram* or *Syria*; and even *Assyrian* from *Assyria*, because it hath also obtained in those places. Divers other Names have been given to it, which have been borrowed from famous Nations and renowned Men, as that of *Hebrew*, because it hath been, during some time, spoken by the *Hebrews*. Although there is some difference between the *Chaldaick* and the *Syriack*, nevertheless it cannot be said that it is essential, for they agree almost in every thing: and this is the cause that in the Holy Scriptures the Words of *Chaldaick* and *Syriack* are promiscuously used to signify the very same Language: it is said for example, that *Daniel* and some other young *Hebrews* were instructed in the *Chaldaick* Tongue: and it is added in the mean time a little after, that the *Chaldeans* spake to the King in *Syriack*, which was the Tongue of that Prince: from whence it is evident, that the *Syriack* and the *Chaldaick* are the same Language.

Dan. 1. 4.

Dan. 2. 4.

(r) De linguae Chaldaicae sive Syriacae nominibus & discrimine. Georg. Amir. Præfud. Gramm.

(s) De linguae Chaldaicae sive Syriacae antiquitate. Ibid.

(t) De linguae Chaldaicae sive Syriacae dignitate ac præstantiâ. Ibid.

The same *George Amira* produceth other Passages of the Scriptures to shew that this Tongue was also called *Assyrian*. This he confirms in like manner from profane Authors, who have confounded the Names of *Chaldeans*, *Syrians* and *Assyrians*. From whence he concludes (u) that it is no wonder that they have also confounded these three Languages. Lastly, he avoucheth, that if the *Chaldaick* Tongue which hath been in use amongst the *Jews* had not been dressed by them after the *Hebrew* Fashion, it would have differed much less than it doth, from the *Chaldaick* or *Syriack* of the natural *Syrians*. *Ludovicus de Dieu* who had thoroughly inquired into this matter, is also of this Opinion. (x) He distinguisheth, as is ordinarily done, the *Chaldaick* Tongue of *Daniel* and *Esdras* from the *Syriack* Paraphrases: but he acknowledgeth at the same time, that these two Languages ought not truly to be distinguished. He believes after *Amira* (y) that they would be less different, if the *Jews* had not Printed the *Chaldaick* of their Books after their manner; this he proves by some Examples. It would be easie to produce many others, and even to make it appear that the great resemblance between these two Tongues hath given occasion to the *Jews* to take from the *Syrians* whole Books of the Scriptures, which they have attributed to their Paraphrases; but this would lead us too far, and we must now return to *Mr. Vossius*, who is so curious in this point, that he will not admit that the *Chaldaick* Tongue, which is named *Hebrew* in the New Testament should be called *Syriack*.

Voss. Resp.
advert. P.
Sim. Obj.

This dextrous Man calls the *Jews* to his assistance, who have stiled the *Aramean* or *Syriack*, the Tongue of the Gentiles: and to make it more manifest to what degree the *Jews* hated the *Syrians* and their Language, he makes use of the authority of the *Talmud*, wherein it is read, that if any one prays in the *Syrian* Tongue, his Prayers are not heard, because the Angels, who are the Ministers of God, do not understand this Language. He adds farther, that the *Jews* who read in *Syria* the Version which the *Christians* and the *Arabians* call *Syriack*, do term it *Chaldaick*. Lastly, he demands who are those People of *Syria* that have introduced into *Jerusalem* this *Syriack*

Voss. ibid.

(u) Quare mirum esse non debet, si lingua Chaldaica, Syriaca & Assyriaca una eademque sit, quandoquidem & nomina quæ ei indita sunt pro eodem usurpantur. *Georg. Amir. Prælud. Gramm. Syr. sive Chald.*

(x) A Syriaca Chaldaicam distingo, quia sic ab aliis fieri solet, & non rari phrasi & flexione ab eâ differt. Alioqui eandem esse linguam fateor Chaldaicam & Syriacam. *Lud. de Dieu, Præf. Gramm. Chald. & Syr.*

(y) Dialectus Chaldaica minus à Syriacâ linguâ differret, si punctatoribus visum fuisset. *Lud. de Dieu, ibid.*

Tongue,

Tongue, which is pretended to have been in use in the time of Jesus Christ and the Apostles.

But if he had consulted the *Talmud*, or had but an indifferent knowledge in the *Chaldaick* Tongue, he would not have made such weak Objections. It is evident that there is nothing more usual in the Books of the *Talmud* than to call the *Chaldaick* or *Babylonian* Tongue *Arami* or *Syriack*. The Rabbins who have epitomized the *Talmud*, and have collected its Decisions, do also give the name of *Arami* or *Syriack* to the *Chaldaick* Tongue. To convince Mr. *Vossius*, even by the example that he hath produced of the Prayer that ought not to be made in the *Syriack* Tongue; the *Talmudists* give out this fantastick Story upon occasion of the Prayer called *Kadis*, which is in the *Chaldaick* Tongue, and which nevertheless they call in this place *Arami* or *Syriack*. This Prayer not being so ancient as the others that have been composed in *Hebrew*, is written in the *Chaldaick* Language, which was then understood by the People. The Rabbins who are so nicely subtil on all occasions, and often tell Tales, instead of giving solid Reasons, have invented this Fable which Mr. *Vossius* relates very seriously. However it be, it is certain that this Prayer *Kadis*, which is supposed, according to the Rabbins to be written in *Syriack*, that is not understood by the Angels, is written in *Chaldaick*, and in the same Language as the Paraphrases which we have upon the Bible.

As for the Objection, that in the *Syriack* Version of the New Testament, the word *Aram* hath been put to signifie a *Greek*, a *Gentile*, and an *Idolater*, I do not see that it can be proved from thence that the *Jews* have not confounded the Words of *Syriack* and *Chaldaick*. For besides that experience shews us the contrary, this only proves that the *Jews* have looked upon *Syria* as the Country of Idolatry; they have made use of the word *Arami* in the same sense as that of *Ἕλλην* *Greek* in the New Testament is applied to signifie a *Greek*, a *Gentile* and an *Idolater*.

I am willing to grant that the *Jews* give the name of *Chaldaick* to the Versions which the Christians call *Syriack*. But what can be concluded from thence, since these same *Jews* do indifferently call that Tongue in which they are written *Chaldaick* or *Syriack*? The Christians of the *Syrian* Nation do very often call their *Syriack* Tongue *Chaldaick*. The *Syriack* *Missal* which hath been Printed at Rome for the use of the *Maronites*, is intituled * *A Chaldaick Missal*. This manifestly makes it appear that the Words *Chaldaick* and *Syriack* are oftentimes confounded together by the *Jews* and by the Christians that bear the Name of *Syrians*.

* *Missale Chaldaic. juxta ritum Ecclesiarum Maronitarum edit. Romae.*

Joseph.
Præf. lib.
de Bell.
Jud.

Lastly the Example of *Josephus* hath been opposed to Mr. *Vossius*, who was a *Jew of Jerusalem*, and who assures us, that before he published his History of the Wars of the *Jews in Greek*, he had written it in *Chaldaick*, which he calls the Language of his Country. Now forasmuch as he cannot deny the matter of Fact which this Historian hath so clearly delivered, he answers after his usual way, that *Josephus* had composed this History in *Chaldaick* only for the *Jews* on the other side of *Euphrates*. But is there any probability, that a Man that makes profession to publish an Account of the Wars of the People of his own Nation for their use, and for this reason to write in their Language, should not have written it for those of *Jerusalem*, which was not only the Capital City, but also his own Country? He would have it design'd only for the perusal of the *Jews* that were far distant: and since there is no appearance of truth in this, he is obliged to have recourse to certain equivocal Terms used by *Josephus*. This Historian saith that in publishing his History in the *Chaldaick* Tongue, he hath had regard τῶν αὐτῶ βαρβάρων, that is to say, according to Mr. *Vossius's* opinion, to those *Barbarians* or *Jews* that were beyond the Empire, because this expression αὐτῶ can only denote People afar off. After this manner he eludes a most clear testimony, under a pretence that these words αὐτῶ according to the Grammatical Sense may be extended equally to time and place. But the design of *Josephus* makes it evident enough, that he set forth his History in *Chaldaick* generally for all those of his Nation, and even rather for those of *Palestine*, than for the *Jews* that dwelt beyond *Euphrates*. They all spake in the *Chaldaick* or *Syriack* Tongue. Therefore this famous Writer makes no distinction of Language in his Preface, when he speaks of those of his Nation; he therein calls the *Chaldaick* the Tongue of his Country. He declares moreover in another place, (z.) that he had attained to the knowledge of the *Greek* by study, and that he could not pronounce it well because he was accustomed to the Accent of his Mother-Tongue. Now it is certain that he was not of the number of these *Partian*, *Babylonian* and *Arabian Jews*, but of those of *Jerusalem*, who consequently had another vulgar Language different from the *Greek*. He praiseth also in this same Passage those of his own Nation upon occasion of

(z) Τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ὃ γερμανιστὸν ἐπέδωκεν μετὰ τὴν τῶν γερμανιστῶν ἐμπειρίαν ἀναλαβόν, ἢ ὃ πάλαι σπερφεῖν ἀκρίβειαν πάτετο ἐκείνου σωπῆσθαι· παρ' ἡμῶν δ' ἐκ ἐκείνου ἀποδύοντι τοὺς πολλὰν ἰθὺν διὰ τὴν ἐκείνου ἐκείνου διὰ τὸ κοινὸν εἶναι νομίζον· τὸ ἐπιδόματα τὸ μόνον ἐκ ἐκείνων τοῖς πυχῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι οἱ ἐκείνων διὰ τὴν, μόνον ὃ σφίον μαρτυρεῖται τοῖς τὸ νόμιμα σφίον ἐπιδόμασι, καὶ τὰ ἐκείνων γερμανιστῶν δύναμιν ἐκείνου δύναμιν. Joseph. Antiq. Jud. lib. 20. cap. ult.

the

the Greek Tongue, because they did not apply themselves to the knowledge of divers Languages, but to the study of their Sacred Books.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Sect of the Nazarenes, and of their Hebrew or Chaldaick Copy of the Gospel of S. Matthew.

BESIDES all the Reasons that we have just now alledged to make it appear, that *S. Matthew* at first composed his Gospel in *Chaldaick*, for the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* who had embraced the Christian Religion, we might also produce the Example of the *Nazarene* Sectaries, who made use of this same *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick* Gospel in their Assemblies. *S. Epiphanius* who hath written very accurately of this ancient Sect, informs us (a) that they received with the New Testament all the Books of the Old, that were in the Canon of the *Jews*, viz. the Law, the Prophets, and the other Parts of Holy Writ; and that they differed in nothing from the *Jews*, as to Doctrine and Ceremonies, save only that they believed in Jesus Christ: they made publick Profession to believe in one God, and in his Son Jesus Christ: they had moreover a perfect knowledge in the *Hebrew* Tongue. He observes also, that these ancient *Nazarenes*, whose principal abode was in the City of *Berea*, and who were dispersed throughout all the lower *Syria*, were descended from the Primitive Christians of the same Name, who retired from *Jerusalem* to *Pella*. From thence *Epiph.* (saith *Epiphanius*) the Sect of the *Nazarenes* derive their original *Her. 29.* *Εν τῷ δὲ νῦν ἡ χριστιανικὴ τοῦ Ναζωραίου αἵρεσις ἔχει τὴν ἀρχαίαν.* This agrees very ^{n. 7.} well with the Testimonies of the ancient Ecclesiastical Authors, who affirm that *S. Matthew* preached the Gospel to the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* and all *Palestin* in their vulgar Tongue. These *Nazarene* Sectaries, who sprang from those primitive Christians of *Jerusalem*, and who also spake their Language, always preserved and read it in their Churches or Assemblies.

(a) Χρῶνται ὅτι ἐστὶν ἡ μόνον νέα Διαθήκη, ἀλλὰ καὶ παλαιὰ καὶ ἀρχαία καὶ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐν τῷ ἀποκριθῆναι παρ' αὐτοῖς νομαδικὰ καὶ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς: τὰ παρὰ Ἰουδαίους καλούμενα βιβλία· ὅτι καὶ ἐπεὶ οὗτοι φρονέουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα τῶν νόμων, καὶ αἱ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πάντα καλῶς ὁμολογοῦσι, καὶ οἱ εἰς Χριστὸν δίδουσι πᾶσι. ὁ δὲ λέγει -- ἵνα ὅτι Θεὸν καὶ ἀγαλλίασιν καὶ τὸν τότε παῖδα Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν· Ἐξ ἐκεῖθεν δὲ διάλεκτον ἀκεκῶς εἶσιν ἐκκλησίαι. *Epiph. Her. 29. n. 7.*

Hieron.
lib. 2.
Comm. in
Es. cap. 5.

The same S. Epiphanius adds, that the *Jews* mortally hated the *Nazarenes*, and that (b) in their Synagogues, where they assemble thrice every day, they solemnly cursed them, saying, Let God curse the *Nazarenes*. This Imprecation of the *Jews* against the *Christians*, under the name of *Nazarenes*, is yet to be found even at this day in their Books. S. Hieron also doth mention it in his Commentaries on the Prophet *Isaiab*; where he saith, speaking of the *Jews*, *Ter per singulos dies in omnibus Synagogis sub nomine Nazarenorum anathematizant vocabulum Christianum*. This hatred came from hence, (c) because the *Nazarenes*, being *Jews* as well as they, and embracing the whole Law of *Moses*, preached besides this, that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*.

We ought then to seek for the Original of the Gospel of S. *Matthew* amongst these *Nazarenes*, who being defended from the primitive Christians of *Jerusalem*, have preserved it in their Churches. S. Epiphanius, who seemed to be persuaded of this Truth, (saith freely (d) that they had for their use the *Hebrew Gospel* of S. *Matthew* most entire, and that it was not to be doubted that they still kept it in his time written in *Hebrew Letters*: he doubts only whether they had retrenched from this Gospel the Genealogy of *Jesus Christ*, which was not in the Copy of the *Ebionites*, who read it also. But it is most probable that the *Nazarenes* had not taken away this Genealogy from their Copies. For (e) *Cerintus* and *Carpocras*, Hereticks of those primitive times, who also used the *Hebrew Gospel* of S. *Matthew*, read the Genealogy entire, and even proved from thence that *Jesus Christ* was sprung from the Seed of *Joseph* and *Mary*.

S. Hieron, who had translated this same Gospel of the *Nazarenes* into Greek and Latin, assures us (f) that these Sectaries still read it in his time in their Assemblies; he had seen two Copies of them, one

(b) Τεῖς δὲ ἡμέρας ὅτι ἐν ἑκάστῃ συναγωγῇ ἐν ταῖς αὐτῶν συναγωγαῖς ἱμαρῶνται αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἀναθεματίζουσι φασκόντες ὅτι ὁπρὸς Ἰακώβου ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ναζωραίου.
Epiph. Har. 19. n. 9.

(c) Διὰ τὸ ὅτι Ἰουδαίων αὐτοὺς ὄντας Ἰησοῦν κηρύττειν εἶναι Χριστόν. Epiph. ibid.

(d) Ἐχουσι δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαίου εὐαγγέλιον πληρὲς αὐτῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ σαφὲς ὅσο καὶ τὸ ἑβραϊκὸν ἐγχαρὶς ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἔπι σκεῖται· ἐν οἷσιν δὲ εἰ καὶ τὰς ψευδαγοίας τὰς κατὰ τὸ Ἀβελὰμ ἀχρεὶ κτείνω σκεῖλον. Epiph. ibid.

(e) Ὁ καὶ κατὰ Κίριου καὶ Καρποκράτους τὸ αὐτὸ χροῖον δίδου παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγέλιον ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ κατὰ Ματθαίου εὐαγγέλιον διὰ τῆς ψευδαγοίας βύλονται πλεῖστον ἐν ἀσέβει· Ἰωσήφ καὶ Μαρίαν δὲ τὸν Χριστόν. Epiph. Har. 30. n. 14.

(f) In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis literis, scriptum est, quo vivunt usque hodie Nazareni. Hieron. lib. 3. adv. Pelag.

(g.) of

(g) of which was kept in the Library of *Cæsarea*, and he had borrowed the other from the *Nazarenes* themselves of *Berea* to copy it out. This was the Copy from which he made his Translation. He saith moreover that (b) many People believed, that this *Hebrew Gospel* whereof the *Nazarenes* and the *Ebionites* made use, was the original of *S. Matthew*. However it be, it seems that the most ancient Ecclesiastical Writers have cited it as the true Gospel of *S. Matthew*, several have believed that *S. Ignatius* Martyr had taken from thence these words of our Saviour to *S. Peter*, which he quotes in his Epistle to those of *Smyrna*: (i) *Touch me, and see that I am not a spirit*. *Eusebius* and *S. Hieron* cite these same words of *S. Ignatius*, which are still to be found at this day in this Epistle. And this last observes that they are taken from the *Hebrew Gospel* of the *Nazarenes*, which he had lately translated: *De Evangelio quod nuper à me translatum est.* Hieron. de Script. Eccles. in Ign.

It is probable that *S. Ignatius*, being Bishop of *Antioch*, had read this Gospel of the *Hebrews* that was spread abroad through *Syria* which the *Nazarenes* inhabited. This induceth me to believe that *Tatian*, who abode also in *Syria*, had made use of the same Gospel, when after his manner he composed one out of four, which some according to *Epiphanius* calls the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*. Epiph. Hier. 46. n. 1. This ought not to be understood, as if this Collection of *Tatian* had not been different from the Gospel of the *Hebrews*; for this would make no sense. *Valesius* hath not made a sufficient Reflection on this Gospel of *Tatian*, when he hath discoursed thereof on this account in his Notes on *Eusebius*. *Grotius* hath made a much better Remark on occasion of this Passage of *S. Epiphanius*, that *Tatian* in the Work which he composed from the four Gospels, had related the words of *S. Matthew*, not only according to the *Greek Copies*, but also according to those which were in *Hebrew*; and that for this reason, this Gospel which was commonly called *Did. τινος*, because it was made out of four, had been named by some Authors, according to the *Hebrews*. He believes moreover, that it is also Vales. Annot. in l. 4. Hist. Eccl. Euseb. c. 29. Grot. Annot. in tit. Matth.

(g) *Ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Cæsarensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque à Nazarenis qui in Berea urbe Syriae hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit.* Hieron. de Script. Eccles. in Matth.

(h) *In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni & Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Græcum sermonem transfulimus, quod vocatur à plerisque Matthæi authenticum, &c.* Idem, Comm. lib. 2. in Matth. c. 12.

(i) *Ἀδελφε, ἁλαθρήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι ἐγὼ σαρκοῦ καὶ αἰμάτων εἰμι.* Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn.

for

* Some nevertheless believe that it should be read *ἑκ πέντε* for this reason, that some others have given it the Name of * *ἑκ πέντε* of five, as having been collected from five Gospels. All this seems to be most probable, were it not that the Gospel of *Tatian* which hath been published, doth not contain that which was singular in the *Hebrew* Copy of the *Nazarenes*.

ἑκ πέντε
707.

Baron. an.
Christ. 34.
n. 72.

Altho *Baronius* is mistaken in several places of his *Annals*, wherein he treats concerning the *Hebrew* Gospel of *S. Matthew*, nevertheless he hath had reason to consider it as an Original. He hath been so bold as to say, according to this Principle, that if there were a necessity of correcting the *Latin* Version of *S. Matthew*, it ought to be done rather after the *Hebrew* Text than the *Greek*: but he is deceived when he attributes this Opinion to *S. Hierom*, and grounds it on the Epistle of this Father to Pope *Damasus*. For *S. Hierom* speaks in this Epistle of the whole New Testament in general, and he would have the faults that were in the *Latin* to be amended from the *Greek* Text from whence the *Latin* hath been taken.

Casaub.
Exercit.
15. ad An-
nal. Ba-
ron. Sect.
4. n. 18.

Casaubon, who hath acknowledged with all antiquity, that *S. Matthew* hath certainly written his Gospel in *Hebrew*, could not allow the opinion of this Cardinal, which he accuseth of Impiety. *Hæc sententia* (saith he) *fidem Catholicæ Ecclesiæ facit pendere, nefas dictu, ab Hæreticorum fide*. He could not comprehend how it could be said that the authority of the *Greek* Text of *S. Matthew* depends on the *Hebrew* Text which is lost. He affirms also that tho we should still have at this day the *Hebrew* Copy, yet we could not consider it as an original Piece from which we ought to correct the *Greek* Version, (k) because none but the *Nazarene* Hereticks and the *Ebionites* have made use of it, as may be proved (as he thinks) by the testimony of *Epiphanius* and *S. Jerom*. He calls those among the *Catholicicks* that have given the name of Authentick to the *Hebrew* Gospel of *S. Matthew*, simple People. They have too easily (saith he) given credit to these Hereticks who boasted that they had the original of this Gospel. (l) This would be according to his Judgment to offer an injury to the Primitive Church, to say that she had suffered wicked Hereticks to ascribe to themselves a Gospel which had been the true original. Lastly he adds, that the *Hebrew* Gospel which hath

(k) In antiquis temporibus, quando Hebræa extabant, Nazareni & Ebionitæ heretici Hebraicum textum sibi vindicarunt, ut testes sunt Hieronymus & Epiphanius. Catholici Græcum semper à principio sunt amplexi. Casaub. Exercit. 16. ad Annal. Bar. sect. 115.

(l) Sine injuriâ veteris Ecclesiæ dici non potest passuram illam fuisse ut impii heretici vindicarent sibi seu proprium eum textum quem constaret esse Ecclesiæ authenticum. Ibid.

been in use among the *Ebionites* and some other Hereticks, was filled with Fables, and that it hath been corrupted in divers places : from whence he concludes, that it cannot pass for an original Piece, according to which the *Greek* Version received by the whole Church might be amended. He calls this last proof an invincible Argument, *Casaubon* *Argumentum invictum*.

But it is an easie matter to shew the weakness of all these Objections of *Casaubon*. I am so far from thinking that the Opinion of *Baronius* can be called impious, that I affirm it on the contrary to be grounded on the testimony of all Antiquity and on good Reason. It is certain, and *Casaubon* himself agrees to it, that *S. Matthew* hath written his Gospel in *Hebrew*, of which the *Greek* is only a Version. This being granted, why may not the Name of an Original be given to this *Hebrew* Text ? There is nothing in this that is not conformable to reason and good sense. This is the Principle on which the Protestants rely when they correct the Versions of the Old Testament from the original *Hebrew* : but (say they) we have no longer the *Hebrew* of *S. Matthew*. It is true, but ought this to hinder us from calling it Authentick with the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, since in effect it is so ? If it were not lost, might we not have recourse thereto at this day to resolve several Difficulties in the *Greek* Version ? We see that *S. Hierom* hath consulted it on the second Verse of the sixth Chapter of *S. Matthew*, where we read in the vulgar *Latin*, *Panem nostrum supersubstantialem da nobis hodie*. (m) He observes that it is in the *Greek* word ἐμέριον, and in the *Hebrew* מחר, which signifies *of to morrow* : from whence he infers, that the sense of this Passage is, *Give us this day our bread of to morrow*, that is to say, *of every day*, as it was in the ancient vulgar *Latin* ; and *S. Jerom* hath kept the word *quotidianum* in *S. Luke*, Chap. xi. 3. This Exposition of the *Greek* word ἐμέριον, which is obscure, is considerable. The Grammarians do at this day dispute concerning its signification : but the *Hebrew* word מחר which was in the Gospel of the *Nazarenes*, resolves all their doubts. This hath caused *Grotius* to say, that after the Testimony of *S. Jerom*, who hath thereupon consulted the *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick* Text, we ought not any longer to dispute about the Original of the *Greek* word ἐμέριον to know the meaning of it.

Grot. Annot. in Evangel. Matth. c. vi. v. 11.

(m) Quod nos supersubstantialem expressimus, in Græco habetur ἐμέριον. --- In Evangelio quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, pro substantiali pane reperi מחר quod dicitur crastinum, id est, futurum da nobis hodie. Hieron. Comm. in Matth. lib. 1. c. 6.

Altho we should have at this very day (continues *Casaubon*) the *Hebrew Gospel* of the *Nazarenes*, we could not make it pass for an original, because it hath been used by Hereticks, and that the Catholics have always adhered to the *Greek Copy* ever since the first beginning of the Church. But tho we should suppose with *Casaubon*, that the *Nazarenes* have been Hereticks, would this hinder their *Hebrew Gospel* which had been written in this Language by *S. Matthew*, from being a true Original? I would willingly know whether the *Hebrew Text* of the Law of *Moses* is less authentick in the Hands of the *Samaritans*, and of the *Jews* called *Caraites*, than it is in the Hands of the other *Jews* who bear the name of *Rabbanites*, and from whom we have received it? The Protestants are on the same bottom with respect to the Church of *Rome*, as the *Ebionites* were heretofore with respect to the Orthodox. This Church reckons them equally in the number of Hereticks; may it be said for this reason that the New Testament which is in use among the Protestants is not authentick? This no rational Catholic will ever avouch. And therefore the proof that *Casaubon* brings from the pretended Heresie of the *Nazarenes*, and from that of the *Ebionites*, is of no weight.

Besides it is not true that the *Hebrew Gospel* of *S. Matthew* hath been in use among the Hereticks only, since, as hath been above shewn, it hath been composed for the Primitive Christians of *Palestin*, from whom the *Nazarene* Sectaries were descended, and the *Greek* is only a Version of it. Neither can it be averred, that the Catholics have not acknowledged any other Copy of *S. Matthew* than that which is in *Greek*, since the *Jews* of the Territory of *Jerusalem* who embraced the Christian Religion, and were called *Nazarenes*, have been the first Christians in the World, it would be a piece of injustice in us to treat them as Hereticks, for this reason only, because they retained the Ceremonies of the Old Law with Christianity: otherwise we must treat the Apostles as Hereticks, who observed them also at the beginning: this might be then tolerated in these Primitive Christians who sprang out from the middle of the *Jews*, and who had before their eyes the Example of Jesus Christ and the Apostles.

That which hath misled *Casaubon* and many others, as well Protestants as Catholics, who have rejected the *Hebrew Gospel* of the *Nazarenes* as an Apocryphal Piece, is that they have not duly reflected on the Original of the Christian Religion. The Primitive Christians of *Jerusalem* and of *Palestin*, who made use of this *Hebrew Gospel*, having not long subsisted in their first estate, and the others on the contrary who spake *Greek*, being dispersed throughout the whole earth; it hath happened from thence that the *Greek Gospel*
only

only hath been preserved amongst the Catholicks, because all the other Christians have taken their Versions from this Copy. The *Chaldaick* Tongue, in which the Gospel of the *Nazarenes* was written, was not understood but by some *Jews*: besides, the *Nazarenes*, who had retained *Judaism* with *Christianity*, became odious to the other Christians who were converted from *Gentilism*, and there was an irreconcilable Hatred between them. If the ancient *Nazarenes* for whom *S. Matthew* had written his Gospel were yet in being, their *Hebrew* Copy would be without doubt preferred before the *Greek* Version which we have.

S. Jerom and *S. Epiphanius* are so far from being favourable to the Judgment of *Casaubon*, that on the contrary they overthrow it in exprels terms, as appears from their Testimonies which we have above related. This is so true, that *Casaubon*, to justifie his Opinion, hath on purpose corrupted a Passage of *St. Epiphanius*, who calls the *Hebrew* Gospel of the *Nazarenes* *ἡ ἡλικία*, most entire; he would have it read, *ἡ ἡλικία*, that was not entire, against all the Editions of the Works of this Father, and without producing any Manuscript to prove an Alteration of this Importance: he saith only, that this place of *S. Epiphanius* is contrary to another, wherein he calls the *Hebrew* Gospel of the *Ebionites*, a Gospel *ἡ ἡλικία*, that was not entire, but *ἡλικία* καὶ ἡλικία, corrupted and mutilated. *Casaubon* hath not taken heed that although the *Nazarenes* and the *Ebionites* did equally make use of the *Hebrew* Gospel of *S. Matthew*, their Copies were nevertheless different: these last, as *S. Epiphanius* himself hath remarked, had corrupted their Copy, and had retrenched from it the Genealogy of *Jesus Christ*, which he saith not of the *Nazarenes*, who had it (if you will believe him) *ἡλικία*, most entire.

It is true that in the very Copy of the *Nazarenes* there were some Additions that seemed to have been inserted therein; but we must not reject an Aët that is altogether entire, under colour that something hath been annexed to it afterwards, especially when these Augmentations come not from suspected Persons that have a design to corrupt it: otherwise we must lay aside the greatest part of Books, there being very few of them wherein some Additions may not be found. There would not be at this day any Copy even of the New Testament, either *Greek*, *Latin*, *Syriack* or *Arabick*, that might be truly called authentick, because there is not one, in whatsoever Language it be written, that is absolutely exempt from Additions. I might also avouch, that the *Greek* Transcribers have taken a very great liberty in writing their Copies, as shall be proved in another place.

Not that I would go about here to defend the vicious Additions and the Corruptions of the *Hebrew* Copy of the *Ebionites*: *Baronius* himself hath never thought of this: he is content to say, (n) that the *Nazarenes* during some time preserved the true Gospel of *S. Matthew* entire, and without any Additions: he confutes the Opinion of *Bede*, who hath believed that this *Hebrew* Gospel ought not to be reckoned in the number of Apocryphal Books: he judgeth, that it ought to be placed in the rank of Apocryphal Pieces, because *S. Jerome* hath quoted in his Works several Passages out of it, which are not to be found in the Copies that have been received and approved of by the Church. (o) It is dangerous (saith this Cardinal) to put it in any other Class than that of Apocryphal Books, because there can be but one Truth. If we understand in the mean time by *Apocryphal*, a false Book, it is not true in that sense, that the Gospel of the *Nazarenes* is Apocryphal; it may be only said, that if there are considerable Additions therein that alter the sense, it is no more Authentick: and this is that which is to be proved. I speak only of the Copy of the *Nazarenes*, and not of that of the *Ebionites*, who had corrupted it on purpose to adjust it to their Prejudices.

Casaub.
Exercit.
16. ad
Annal.
Bar. n.
126.

We ought not, notwithstanding, to compare the *Hebrew* Gospel of the *Nazarenes*, as *Casaubon* hath done, with the Gospel intituled according to the *Egyptians*, the Acts of *Barnabas*, the Prophecy of *Cham*, and other Books that have been forged by Impostors. It is not to be doubted on the contrary, that the Gospel of the *Nazarenes* hath been certainly composed by the Apostle whose Name it bears: as for what concerns the Additions which the *Nazarenes* might have inserted in the first Original of *S. Matthew*, it may happen that they are not false: we ought rather to attribute them to their Simplicity, and to their good Faith, than to their malice. It was the custom in these Primitive times of Christianity, to take a great deal of pains to inform themselves of that which the Disciples of the Apostles had learned of their Masters, as appears by the Example of *Papias* who lived in those times, of *S. Irenaeus* who was not long after, and of some others of the Ancients. It is probable that the *Nazarenes* have annexed to their Gospel of *S. Matthew* the like Histories which they had learned, and which they believed to be founded on good Testimonies: therefore they are not all to be rejected

(n) *Nazarei Evangelium Matthaei, quod semel acceperant, aliquandiu illibatum incorruptumque servarunt.* Baron. Ann. Ch. 41. n. 18.

(o) *Periculosum esse putamus id in aliam quam in apocryphorum classem referre, cum non nisi una possit esse veritas.* Bar. ibid.

as false, though they are not to be found in any of the Copies that are used and allowed by the Church. It may be observed, that all the Churches of the World have taken their Versions from the Greek Copy wherein these Additions are not expressed, because the Gospel of S. Matthew had been apparently translated out of Hebrew into Greek before the Nazarenes had inserted them.

Furthermore, these Differences of the Hebrew Gospel of the Nazarenes from our Copy, seem to have been numerous enough, if we may judge of them by those that S. Jerom hath left us in divers Passages of his Works, a part of which hath been collected by some Commentators on the New Testament. Nevertheless, there is a diversity of Opinions as to some of these Histories or Additions of the Nazarenes: all men, for example, are not agreed that the History of the adulterous Woman, of whom mention is made Chap. viii. of S. John, hath been in their Hebrew Gospel. That which hath given occasion to believe it, is the Testimony of Papias, who had lived with the Disciples of the Apostles: he saith (p) that the History of the Woman who was accused of many Sins before our Saviour, is to be read in the Gospel that was called according to the Hebrews; which seems not to be meant of any other than that adulterous Woman, whom S. John hath mentioned. Nevertheless, Baronius hath thought, and some others after him, that the History related in Eusebius by Papias is different from that whereof S. John speaks, because (q) Papias discourseth of a Woman accused of many Crimes in general, whereas S. John simply takes notice of an adulterous Woman: but there is but little likelihood that Papias should have designed to describe in this Passage any other than the adulterous Woman, though his Expression runs in general terms. This hath caused several learned men to believe, that the History of the adulterous Woman hath been taken from the Hebrew Gospel of the Nazarenes, and that it hath been afterwards inserted into that of S. John: indeed it is not found in a great number of Copies of this Gospel, as we shall shew hereafter.

I shall only observe here, that if this be true, we ought not to cast away, as false Histories, all the Additions that the Nazarenes had inserted into their Hebrew Copy of S. Matthew, because they might have received them from good hands.

(p) Ἰστέον ὅτι γυναικὶς ἐν πολλαῖς ἀμάρτιαις διαβουλεύσας ἐν τῷ κρείττῳ, τὸ ἁγίον Ἐβραϊστὶς εὐαγγέλιον ἀκούει. Pap. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 39.

(q) Cum Papias multorum criminum dicat illam feminam accusatam, Femines vero habeat unius tantum facinoris, nempe quod deprehensa esset in adulterio, insinuatam, planè diversam ab illa fuisse, cujus nulla esset mentio apud Evangelistam, significare videtur. Baron. ann. Christ. 99. n. 6.

Baron.
Ann. c. 34.
p. 182.

Hieron.
de Script.
Eccl. in
Jacobo.

It is for this reason that Cardinal *Baronius* authorizeth an Apparition of our Saviour to *S. James*, which was found only in the Copy of the *Nazarenes*, and is related after this manner by *S. Jerom*; *Evangelium quoque quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, & à me nuper in Græcum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo & Origines sæpe utitur, post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert: " Dominus autem cum dedisset sindonem servo sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum, & apparuit ei. " Juraverat enim Jacobus, se non comesturum panem ab illa hora qua biberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem à mortuis. Rursusque post paululum: Afferte, ait Dominus, mensam & panem. Statimque additur; Tulit panem, & benedixit ac fregit, & post dedit Jacobo Justo, & dixit ei, Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit filius hominis à dormientibus. Baronius, who hath also inserted into his Annals this Extract of the Gospel of the *Nazarenes*, adds, that (r) *S. Jerom* did not believe that it was false, because he rejected it not in that place, as he was wont to do when he cited Apocryphal Pieces. If this observation of the Cardinal be true, the greatest part of the Additions of this Gospel will then be admitted, because *S. Jerom* is ordinarily content to rehearse them simply without disapproving them.*

Hieron.
Comm.
lib. 2. in
c. 12.
Matth.

After this manner also on Chap. xii. of *S. Matthew*, wherein mention is made of a Man who had his hand withered, and was healed by Jesus Christ, he quotes the *Hebrew Gospel* of the *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites*, where this History is written more at large, and with other Circumstances. It is specified therein, that this Man was a Mason by Trade, and that he thus addressed himself to our Saviour; *I was a Mason, that gained my Livelihood by working. I pray thee, Jesus, to heal me, that I may not be obliged shamefully to beg.* *S. Jerom* is so far from rejecting this History as a Fable, that he saith on the contrary in this same Passage, that the Gospel of the *Nazarenes*, from whence he hath taken it, passeth for Authentick in the Judgment of many People. In *Evangelio* (saith this learned Father) *quo utuntur Nazareni & Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo sermone transfulimus, & quod vocatur à plerisque Matthæi Authenticum, homo iste qui aridam habet manum cementarius scribitur, istiusmodi vocibus auxilium precans: " Cementarius eram manibus victum quæritans. Precor te, Jesu, ut mihi restituas sanitatem, ne turpiter meredicem cibos.*

(r) Hactenus ex dicto Evangelio Nazæorum Hieronymus, qui cum non excipiat de apocrypho, ut de aliis assolet, se ejusdem historiæ fidem hand impugnasse demonstrat. Baron. ibid.

Moreover, S. Jerom cites two other considerable Passages of this same Gospel at the beginning of his third Book against the *Pelagians*, without lessening their credit by any Restriction. The first hath regard to the Baptism of S. *John*, whereof Jesus Christ said that he had no need; and the other is a various reading of the 21 and 22 Verses of the xviii. Chap. of S. *Matthew*. In *Evangelio* (saith S. *Jerom*) *Hieron. juxta Hebræos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis lib. 3. adv. literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni secundum Aposto- Pelag. los, sive ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthæum, quod & in Cæsariensi habetur Bibliotheca, narrat historia.* "Ecce mater Domini & fratres
 " ejus dicebant ei, Joannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem pec-
 " catorum, eamus & baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis, quid pec-
 " cavi ut vadam & baptizer ab eo, nisi fortè hoc ipsum quod dixi
 " ignorantia est. Et in eodem volumine. Si peccaverit, inquit, frater
 " tuus in verbo, & satis tibi fecerit, septies in die suscipe eum. Di-
 " xit illi Simon discipulus ejus, septies in die? Respondit Dominus,
 " & dixit ei, etiam ego dico tibi usque septuagesies. Etenim in Pro-
 " phetis quoque, postquam uncti sunt Spiritu Sancto, inventus est
 " sermo peccati.

The same *Nazarenes* read also otherwise than we have it in our Copies, the 16 and 17 Verses of the iii. Chapter of S. *Matthew*, when the Baptism of Jesus Christ is mentioned. S. *Jerom* hath taken notice in his Commentary on *Isaiab*, that they read it after this manner: *Factum est autem cum ascendisset Dominus de aqua, de- Evang. scendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti, & requievit super eum, & dixit illi, Nazar. fili mi, in omnibus Prophetis expectabam te ut venires, & requiescerem in apud te: tu es enim requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus qui regnas in Hier. l. 4. Comm. in sempiternum. Es. c. 11.*

Amongst the Miracles that happened at the Death of our Saviour, and that are declared in the xxvii. Chap. of S. *Matthew*, the *Nazarenes* relate this in their Gospel, (s) that the top of the Gate of the Temple, that was of a prodigious bigness, was broken in pieces; whereas we read only in our Copies, that the Vail of the Temple was rent in twain.

I shall take no notice of some other Examples that I might produce of the diversity that was found between the Hebrew Gospel of the *Nazarenes* and the Greek, which hath remained alone in use throughout all the Churches in the World. I shall only add to what hath been already observed, that in the xxiii. Chapter of

Mat. xxvii.

51.

(s) In *Evangelio* cujus sæpe facimus mentionem, superliminare templi infinita magnitudinis fractum esse atque divisum legimus. *Hieron. lib. 4. Comment. in Matth. c. 27.*

S. *Matthew*, ver. 25. where we read *Zacharias Son of Barachias*, (t) the *Nazarenes* had in their Copy according to the Testimony of S. *Jerom*, *Zacharias Son of Fojada*: and this Reading is confirmed by that which is related concerning this *Zacharias* in the Old Testament. Now according to our Copies, the Father of *Zacharias* must have had two Names: and since this doth not appear to us, I believe that in this place the *Hebrew Gospel* ought to be preferred before the other Copies, especially there being no prejudice that could have obliged the *Nazarenes* or the *Ebionites* to make any alteration in this Point.

We may see plainly, by all these Examples, what hath been the *Hebrew Gospel* of S. *Matthew*; or as others call it, *of the twelve Apostles*, which hath been used by the *Nazarenes*: we may judge also, at the same time, that it was different enough from our Copies. It would be in the mean time a piece of Rashness to put all these diversities in the number of Fables with *Casaubon*, (u) who hath made no scruple to rank this Gospel amongst those that have been counterfeited under the Names of S. *Thaddæus* and S. *Thomas*. *Grotius*, who discourseth thereof with more Moderation, (x) believes that the *Nazarenes* have inserted that which they have in their Copies and which is not in ours, relying upon certain Relations that they had heard. It is for this reason that when he speaks of the History of the adulterous Woman, of whom mention is made in S. *John*, and which he judgeth to have been taken out of the Gospel of these *Nazarenes*, that he forbears not to ascribe to it the same Authority, as if the Apostles were the true Authors of it. He acknowledgeth nevertheless, that it was not originally neither in the *Hebrew* of S. *Matthew*, nor in the *Greek* of S. *John*; *nec à Matthæo scriptam in Hebræo Evangelio, nec à Joanne in Græco*. He believes that (y) the *Nazarenes* of *Palestine* had added it to their *Hebrew Gospel*, because it came from the Apostles; and that afterwards *Papias* and the other Disciples of S. *John* had put it into his

(t) In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni, pro filio Barachia, filium Fojada, reperimus. Hieron. lib. 4. Comm. in Matth. c. 23.

(u) Tam igitur apocryphum hoc Evangelium, quam illud quod Thaddæi dicebatur, aut quod Thomæ adscribebant, & pro vero usurpabant Manichæi. Casaub. ad Ann. Eccles. Baron.

(x) Narrationes quædam non præscriptæ à Matthæo, sed auditu perceptæ videntur paulatim à Nazaræis assuetæ ut quæ penes ipsos erant exemplaribus. Grot. Annot. in tit. Matth.

(y) Quia Apostoli vivâ voce hanc historiam sæpè narraverant, attestam à Nazaræis quidem Palestine Hebræo Evangelio, à Papiâ autem aliisque Joannis discipulis Græco Joannis, & ab Ecclesia probatam, ideo quod satis certo testimonio constaret ab Apostolis traditam. Grot. Annot. in c. 8. Joann.

Gospel written in *Greek*, which said History hath been approved by the Church, because it was grounded on an Apostolical Tradition. *Fansenius* Bishop of *Gand*, who had written the same thing before *Grotius* (z.) would have this History considered as Canonical, because *Papias* had received it from his Master, and because it hath been allowed by the Church; he saith nevertheless, that it might happen that S. *John* hath added it himself to his Gospel after he had written it; and that for this reason it was not found in some Copies.

But there seems to be but little Probability in this last Remark, and there can be nothing determined thereupon with any certainty. We only know that *Papias* reckons in the number of Histories which he had learned from the Disciples of the Apostles, that which hath regard to the Woman accused of many Crimes in the Presence of our Saviour; and that he adds at the same time, that it was related in the Gospel which was called according to the *Hebrews*. Now since it is not unlikely that this Woman accused of many Crimes is the same with the adulterous Woman of whom S. *John* makes mention, it seems as if it might be inferred from thence, that in the time of *Papias* this History was not to be found but in the *Hebrew* Gospel of the *Nazarenes*. This makes it appear, that all the Additions which have been inserted into this Gospel ought not to be accounted as Fables, since *Papias* hath produced one of them which came from an Apostolical Tradition: this might be also said of the others with some Probability. *Hegesippus*, who was familiarly acquainted with the Disciples of the Apostles, (II) hath also sometimes made use of the *Hebrew* or *Syriack* Gospel of the *Nazarenes*, and he hath quoted it even in *Hebrew*: from whence *Eusebius* concludes, that he must needs be of the number of the *Hebrews* that had embraced the Christian Religion.

(z) *Ex quibus satis patet hanc historiam non in primis fuisse ab Evangelistâ hoc loco descriptam, sed vel ex apocrypho illo Evangelio additam, quæ tamen auctoritatem obtinuerit, non quòd in apocryphis scripta fuerit, sed quòd eam Papias è suo doctore audierit, quòdque hanc Ecclesiæ consensus, ut Evangelio dignam comprobaret, vel Joannem post semel descriptum à se Evangelium adiecisse hanc partem suo Evangelio, ut ob id contingerit in quibusdam codicibus haberi, in quibusdam non.* Janf. Episc. Gand. Comm. in Concor. Eu. c. 76.

(II) *Ἐκ τῆ τοῦ κρη' Ἑβραίου εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ, καὶ ἰδιῶς ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊκοῦ διαλέκτου πρὸς τὴν ἑβραίων καὶ Ἑβραίων ταυτὸν μὲν ἀκούει.* Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. c. 22.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Ebionites. Of their Copy of the Gospel of S. Matthew. Of some other ancient Hereticks who have made use of this same Gospel.

*Iren. l. 3.
adv. Her.
c. 4.*

WE have already observed in discoursing of the *Nazarenes*, that the *Ebionites* did also make use of the *Hebrew Gospel* of *S. Matthew* as well as they; but that they had nevertheless altered and corrupted it in some places, to make it agreeable to their false Notions and Prejudices. *Ebionæi* (saith *S. Irenæus*) *eo Evangelio, quod est secundum Matthæum, solo utentes, ex illo ipso convincuntur.* The ancient Ecclesiastical Writers (according to *Eusebius*) have called these Sectaries *Ebionites*, from a Word that signifies in *Hebrew* Poor, because they had poor Conceptions concerning *Jesus Christ*, whom they believed to be a simple Man. (a) *They made use of that Gospel only* (adds this Historian) *which was called according to the Hebrews, little esteeming the rest.* *Origen*, who hath been followed by *Eusebius*, (b) doth also derive the Etymology of the Name of these Hereticks from the *Hebrew Word Ebion*, which signifies Poor, because they were (saith he) poor in Judgment, and wanted Understanding.

*Luke vi.
20.*

*Luke vii.
20.*

*Matth. xi.
15.*

But all this seems to me to be ill grounded, and to be but a simple Allusion to the Name of these Sectaries, which indeed signifies Poor in the *Hebrew Tongue*. It is more probable that the *Jews* called them so in derision and scorn; because in these Primitive times of Christianity there were scarce any but poor People that had embraced it. This gave occasion to *Jesus Christ* to say to his Disciples, *Blessed be ye poor, for yours is the Kingdom of God.* This Kingdom of God was the Gospel on which they believed: therefore our Saviour saith in another place, that *the Gospel is preached to the Poor.* *Origen* himself seems to confirm this Opinion in his Books against *Celsus*, where he observes, that (c) the Word *Ebion* signifieth Poor

(a) 'Ευαγγελίον δὲ μόνον τὸ κατὰ 'Εβραίων λεγόμενον καὶ Ἰσραηλίων συνικνεῖν ἐποιήσαντο λέγον. *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 27.*

(b) Οἱ πτωχοὶ τῇ διαβολῇ 'Εβιωναῖοι τῆς πτωχείας τῆς διαβολῆς ἐπώνυμοι. 'Εβίων γὰρ ὁ πτωχὸς παρὰ 'Εβραίοις ὀνομάζεται. *Orig. lib. 4. de princ. apud Vales. Annot. in lib. 3. Hist. Eccles. Euseb.*

(c) 'Εβίων τὸ γὰρ ὁ πτωχὸς κατὰ 'Ιουδαίους καλεῖται. ὁ 'Εβιωναῖος χρηματίζεσθαι οἱ κατὰ 'Ιουδαίων τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὡς χεῖρον παραδείγματι. *Orig. lib. 2. contra Celsum.*

in *Hebrew*, and that they have given the name of *Ebionites* or *poor* to those among the *Jews* who have believed that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*.

Since then the *Jews* called those of their own Nation that turned *Christians*, *Nazarenes* and *Galileans*, by way of contempt, it is also very probable, that they have named them *Ebionites* or *poor*. It may be further said, that these Primitive *Christians* took this Name themselves conformably to their Profession. This agrees very well with the Remark of *S. Epiphanius*, who informs us, that the *Ebionites* (d) boasted of this Name, giving it out, that they were poor in imitation of the Apostles; the custom being in those times to sell their Goods, and to lay them at their Feet. This Name degenerated afterwards into that of a Sect, which was a Branch of the *Nazarenes*, and held certain particular Opinions; but in the rest they agreed with them in the same Foundation of Religion as to every thing that concerned the Old Law, which they kept equally with Christianity. *S. Epiphanius* in the mean time will have it that there hath certainly been a Man called *Ebion*, from whom the *Ebionites* took their original, who lived at the same time with the *Nazarenes* and *Cerintians*. It may well be, that this Father and all the others who have thought that there was indeed a Man named *Ebion*, Author of the Sect of the *Ebionites*, have had no better grounds whereon to establish this *Ebion*, than a certain *Spanish* Historian, who hath written the History of the Popes in his Language, hath had in like manner to invent a Man called *Hugo* a Sacramentarian Arch-Heretic, *Hugo Hæresiarcha Sacramentarius*, (e) from whom the Heretics of *France* have been named *Hugonots*.

The same *S. Epiphanius* more exactly describes the original of these Sectaries, whose beginning and first appearance he dates after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, and at that time when the Primitive *Christians* that were called *Nazarenes*, and were lately departed from this City, came to dwell at *Pella* in the Province of *Decapolis*. It appears from thence that the *Ebionites* are only an Off-spring of the ancient *Nazarenes*, having nevertheless corrupted the purity and simplicity of the Faith of these primitive *Christians*. Therefore they revised the original *Hebrew* of *S. Matthew*, to make it more con-

(d) 'Αυτοὶ δὲ εἶδεν συμμύνοντες, ἑαυτοὺς φερόμεντας πτωχοὺς, διὰ τὸ, φασίν, ἐν γένεσις ἢ ἀποστόλων πωλεῖν τὰ αὐτῶν ὑπόδηματα, καὶ πιδεῖναι περὶ τοῦ πόδαυς ἢ ἀποστόλων, καὶ εἰς πτωχείαν καὶ ἀποταξίαν μετεληλυθέναι· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ πάντων φασὶ πτωχοί. *Epiph. Hær. 30. n. 17.*

(e) *Hugo de quibus se llaman los herejes de Francia Hugonotes. Illefcas lib. 6. de la Hilt. Pontif. fol. 453.*

formable to their Opinions. It will not be amiss here to produce some Fragments of their Gospel which *Epiphanius* hath transmitted to us.

In the first place he saith in general (f) that the Gospel of the *Ebionites* was not entire, but corrupted and mutilated. They had taken out of it the Genealogy of Jesus Christ, and all that follows to Chapter 3. of *S. Matthew* (g) beginning their Gospel with these words, *It came to pass in the days of Herod the King of Judæa, that John came baptizing the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan, who was said to be of the race of Aaron the priest the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, and all people came unto him.*

The Baptism of our Saviour by *S. John* was related after this manner in the Gospel of the *Ebionites*. (h) *After the people had been baptised, Jesus came also, and was baptised by John, and as he ascended out of the water, the Heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit of God in the form of a Dove, which descended and came towards him; and a voice was heard from heaven saying, thou art my beloved son, in thee have I been well pleased. And continuing (i) This day have I begotten thee, and immediately a great light shone about the place: and John having seen it, saith unto him, who art thou, Lord? And again a voice from heaven said unto him, this is my beloved son in whom I have been well pleased; and then John falling down before him said, I pray thee, Lord, baptisethou me: but he forbade him, saying, suffer it to be so; for thus it becometh all things to be fulfilled.*

We may judge by that which we have now produced of the Gospel of the *Ebionites*, that the order of the words was not altogether the same as in our Copies, and that there were besides some Alterations and Additions. There is another Passage at the beginning of the Gospel,

(f) Ἐν τῷ παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίῳ χτ' Ματθαίου ἰννομαζομένου, ἔχ' ὅλην δὲ πληρη-
σάτω, ἀλλὰ νεν' δαριδύῳ καὶ ἡρωπειασιδύῳ, &c. *Epiph. Har. 30. n. 13.*

(g) Ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ τῆ παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίου ἔχει· ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου
τῷ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἦλθεν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανόιας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ
ποταμῷ, ὃς ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἐκ γένους Ἀαρὼν τῷ ἱερεὺς πατρὶς Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ἐλισάβετ· καὶ
ὅς ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες. *Epiph. ibid.*

(h) Τὸ λαὸν βαπτισθέντες ἦλθεν καὶ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ· καὶ ὡς
ἀνέλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ἠνοίσθησαν οἱ ἑσπεροὶ, καὶ εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἄνωγον
ἐν εἰδει περιστερᾶς καταβύσσης καὶ ἐπισπένδοντος εἰς αὐτὸν· καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ ἑσπεροῦ
λέγουσα· σὺ με εἶς ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπῶμεν, ἐν σοὶ ἠνδοκῆσα. *Evang. Ebion. apud Epiph. ibid.*

(i) Ἐγὼ σήμερον γεννήθηκα σοι· καὶ ἐνδοὺς περιέλαμψεν τὸν τόπον ὥς μέγα· ὃν
ἰδὼν, φησὶν· ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ πῶς εἶ κύριε; καὶ πάλιν φωνὴ ἐξ ἑσπεροῦ
πρὸς αὐτὸν· ὅτις ὅταν ὁ υἱὸς μου ἀγαπῶμεν, ἐφ' ὃν ἠνδοκῆσα· καὶ τότε, φησὶν,
ὁ Ἰωάννης σπαρασσὼν αὐτῷ ἔλεγε· θιουαί σοι, κύριε, σὺ με βάπτισον· ὁ δὲ ἐκώ-
λυεν αὐτὸν λέγων· ἀφες, ὅτι ὅτως ὅτι πρέπειον πληροθῆναι πάντας. *Evang. Ebion. ibid.*

from

from whence we may be able to take a better estimate thereof (k) There was a certain man, Jesus by name, of about thirty years of age, who hath chosen us, and being come to Capernaum he entered into the house of Simon surnamed Peter, and opening his mouth he said, When I passed along the lake of Tiberias I chose John and James the sons of Zebedee, and Simon and Andrew and Thaddæus and Simon Zelotes and Judas Iscariot, and I called thee Matthew sitting at the receipt of custom, and thou hast followed me. I will then that you be twelve Apostles for a testimony unto Israel. And John was baptising, and the Pharisees came unto him, and were baptised, and all Jerusalem, and John had his raiment of camels hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his food was wild honey, that had the taste of Manna, as a cake dipt in oil. S. Epiphanius here reproves the Ebionites for having corrupted the Gospel of S. Matthew, in reading *ἔγειραι* instead of *ἀγείρας*. But this alteration could have happened only in the Greek, and not in their Hebrew or Syriack Copy, wherein there is no such resemblance of words. They must either have a particular Greek Translation, which they had made for their own use, or they must have adjusted ours to their Text.

Furthermore these Sectaries were different from the Nazarenes, with respect to the Holy Scriptures: for whereas these received, as hath been already observed, all the Old Testament, as it was in the Canon of the Jews; the Ebionites on the contrary rejected all the Prophets. They abhorred the Names of David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiab, Daniel and Ezechiel: they only adhered to the Pentateuch, and they did not much regard that neither. (l) What use (said they) can there be made of the Law after the coming of the Gospel? And when they were asked why they had a veneration for Moses, Abraham and the other ancient Patriarchs: they answered, That they therein followed the example of Jesus Christ.

(k) Ἐγένετο τις ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦς, καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, εἰς Ἐλεάζαρον ἡμῶν· καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Καφαρναὺμ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμων καὶ τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρου, καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἶπε, παρεργάζωμαι ὧδε· καὶ πλὴν λίγων τίς τινος Ἐλεάζαρον Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰακώβον υἱὸς Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Σίμωνα, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν, καὶ Θαδδαῖον, καὶ Σίμωνα Ζηλωτὴν, καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, καὶ σὺ τὸν Ματθαῖον καθήμενον ἐπὶ τῷ τελωνίῳ ἐκάλεσας, καὶ ἠκολούθησός μοι· ὑμεῖς ἂν βούλομαι εἶναι δεκάδω ἀποστόλους εἰς μαρτυρεῖν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ· καὶ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων, καὶ ἔρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν θαλασσίαι, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο καὶ πάντα Ἰερουσαλὴμ· καὶ ἦρχεν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἰνδύματι ἀπὸ τριχὸν καμήλου, καὶ ζώνῃ δερματίνῃ περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτοῦ· καὶ τὸ βρώμιον αὐτοῦ φασί, μέλι ἀγέρον, καὶ ἡ γαστήρ αὐτοῦ τὰ μάννα, ὡς ἐγκεῖς ἐν εἰλαίνῳ. Evang. Ebion. apud Epiph. ibid.

(l) Τίς χρεία με ἀναγνώσκειν τὰ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ἐλθόντι τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. Ebion. apud Epiph. ibid. n. 18.

Epiph. ib.
u. 1.

It is probable that the *Ebionites* who received no other but the five Books of *Moses*, and only considered *Josua* in quality of his Successor, were descended from some *Samaritans* who embraced Christianity in imitation of the *Nazarenes*. Thus *Epiphanius* hath observed that *Ebion* was infected with the Superstitions of the *Samaritans*: *Σαμαριτῶν μὴ δὲ ἔχει τὸ βδελυγνόν*. Whereas they both retain the Old Law with the Gospel, the *Ebionites* do only keep the Books of *Moses*, because the *Samaritans* have never received any but these five Books as Canonical. But the *Nazarenes* who passed from *Judaism* to the Christian Religion, continued to read the whole Old Testament, as they read it before in their Synagogues. S. *Epiphanius* hath further remarked, that these *Ebionites* (m) had their Priests or Elders, and their Chiefs of the Synagogue. For they call not (saith he) their Assembly a Church, but a Synagogue. He speaks apparently of the *Ebionites* that understood the *Greek* Tongue, and even read a *Greek* Translation of their *Hebrew* or *Syriack* Gospel: For this distinction between the Words Synagogue and Church is not to be found in the *Hebrew* or *Syriack*, and the sense of these two words is the same in the *Greek*; as it is easie to prove from the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint.

The *Ebionites* were not content only to have corrupted the Gospel of S. *Matthew*, but they forged also divers Books, (according to *Epiphanius*) (n) under the Names of *James*, *Matthew* and other Disciples of Jesus Christ. They read one in like manner under the Name of S. *John*, abusing by this means the Names of the Apostles, that they might the more easily impose on those of their party. (o) Besides they made use of the Voyages of S. *Peter*, written by S. *Clement*: but they had so altered and mangled them, that there hardly remained any thing of Truth; they modelled them after a new manner, and suited them to their humors, to cause S. *Peter* to utter abundance of Falsities that authorized that which was practised among them. These Hereticks may be easily convinced of having retrenched from their Copy of S. *Matthew* the Genealogy of Jesus

(m) Πρεσβύτερος ἐστὶ ἔχουσιν καὶ ἀρχισυναγωγὸν· συναγωγὴν δὲ ἐστὶ ἐκκλησίαν. Epiph. ibid.

(n) Τῶν ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματα εἰς τινὲς τοῦ ἡπατιωμένων Ἰσὺ αὐτῶν περὶ πνευματικῶν ἀρχόντων· βίβλος τε καὶ ὀνόματι αὐτῶν παλαιῶν ἀνεγέγραπται, ὡς ἀπὸ πνευματικῶν Ἰακώβου, καὶ Ματθαίου, καὶ ἄλλων μαθητῶν, ἐν οἷς ὀνόματι καὶ τὸ ὄνομα Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐγκαταλέγεται. Epiph. ibid. n. 22.

(o) Χράνται καὶ ἄλλοις ποτὶ βίβλοις, ὡς ἐν ταῖς περὶ τοῦ Πέτρου ταῖς διὰ Κλήμεντος γεγραμμέναις, νομίζοντες μὴ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς, ὅλγα τι ἀληθινὰ εἶδωσιν· ἐν ταῖς ὅμως περὶ τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου ἐκτετακται. Epiph. ibid. n. 15.

Christ:

Christ: for the *Cerinthians* and the *Carpocratians* who read it, and who held the same Opinions as they do touching the Birth of our Saviour, had this Genealogy in their Copy, they refer to this to prove that Jesus Christ was a mere Man. Now these *Cerinthians* had established their Sect before that of the *Ebionites* appeared. S. *Epiphanius* believes (p.) that these last had chosen for their use the *Hebrew Gospel* of S. *Matthew* only, in imitation of the *Cerinthians*.

Cerintus was a zealous Defender of the Circumcision as well as the *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites*. I know not from whence the same S. *Epiphanius* hath taken that which he reports concerning him, to wit, that he was the Ringleader of a Faction that rose up at *Jerusalem* against S. *Peter*, on occasion that he was found among the uncircumcised, and had eaten with them. It is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, that the Faithful that were circumcised disputed on this Subject against this holy Apostle. *Cerintus* (if we may believe S. *Epiphanius*) was the chief in this Dispute, when he was yet in the number of the Faithful, and took this pretence to separate himself from them. The Church was divided from that time into different Opinions. Some of them that were circumcised would not submit to the Revelation that had been made to S. *Peter* in the City of *Joppa*; they insisted that none ought to be received into the Church but those that were circumcised; and they that were of this Sect retained the *Hebrew Gospel* of S. *Matthew*, because they were come from *Judaism*. Therefore the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers have called this Gospel *according to the Hebrews*. The others on the contrary, who were for the most part converted from *Gentilism*, made use of the *Greek Copy* of this same Gospel; and this last alone is preserved in the Church: that of the *Hebrews* remained only among some Sectaries, and hath been lost at the same time when these Sects have been extinct.

(p) Τότω δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς καὶ οἱ χριστιανοὶ κήρυττον λέγοντες μὴ ἔχειν δὲ αὐτὸ ἑβραῖον.
 *Euseb. Epiph. *ibid.* n. 3.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Greek Copy of S. Matthew, and its Authority. A Comparison of this Copy with the Hebrew or Chaldaick. An Answer to the Objections of some Hereticks against this Gospel.

ALL Antiquity is agreed, that the Original of the Gospel of S. Matthew hath been written in the Language that the Jews of Jerusalem spake at that time, and that it hath been since translated into Greek. But we have nothing certain concerning the Author of this Greek Version. (a) Matthew (saith S. Jerom) is the first that hath written the Gospel of Jesus Christ in Hebrew for the use of the Jews that had embraced Christianity; but it is not known who hath translated it out of Hebrew into Greek. The Author of the *Synopsis*, attributed to S. Athanasius, affirmeth nevertheless (b) that it hath been first composed in Hebrew by S. Matthew, who published it in Jerusalem in this same Tongue; and that S. James who hath been the first Bishop of this City translated it into Greek. He produceth no Act of the ancient Writers of the Church to justify this Opinion. Papias on the contrary, who was not far distant from the time of the Apostles, declares, (c) that the Original of S. Matthew was in Hebrew, and that afterwards every one interpreted it as he was able. This makes me think that in these primitive times of the Christian Religion divers private persons had translated this Gospel for their own use, and almost after the same manner as there have been several Latin Versions from the Greek, tho there was one that was more generally received in the Churches than the others. It is probable also that the Cerinthians, the Carpocratians, the Ebionites, and in one word all the ancient Sectaries, who preferred the Hebrew

(a) Matthæus, qui & Levi, ex publicano Apostolus primus in Judæa propter eos qui ex circumcisione crediderunt, Evangelium Christi Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit. Quod quis postea in Græcum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Hieron. de Script. Eccl. in Matth.

(b) Το μὲν καὶ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον ἐγγράφη ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ τῷ Ματθαίῳ τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ διαλέκτῳ, καὶ ἔξεδόθη ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἡρμωμένῳ δὲ ὑπὸ Ἰακώβου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ κυρίου. Athan. in *Synops. S. Script.*

(c) Ματθαῖος μὲν ἐν Ἑβραϊκῇ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συναγγέλατο ἡρμωμένον δὲ αὐτὰ ὡς ἠδύνατο ἕκαστος. Pap. apud Euseb. lib. 3. Hist. Eccl. c. 39.

Gospel of *S. Matthew* before the others, made *Greek* Versions of it for their use, as well as the Orthodox.

Casaubon, who hath used his utmost endeavours to decry the *Hebrew* Gospel which the *Nazarenes* and the *Ebionites* had kept, that he might give the greater authority to the *Greek*, avoucheth freely that the Fathers are very much divided in their Opinions on this Subject; some ascribing this Version to *S. James*, others to *S. John*, others to *S. Barnabas*; and lastly some few to *S. Paul* and *S. Luke*. (d) This diversity of Opinions (adds he) plainly shews that it cannot be certainly affirmed who hath been the Author of this *Greek* Version: but it serves (saith he) for a demonstration to make it appear that it is derived from the very times of the Apostles, who are the Authors or Promoters of it; or rather it ought to be attributed to the Holy Ghost, whose Instruments they have been.

But can that be called a Demonstration which is only grounded on uncertain Conjectures? Would it not be more prudent to refer our selves herein to the testimony of *Papias*, who hath lived with the Disciples of the Apostles? If there had been in his time a *Greek* Version of the Gospel of *S. Matthew*, which had been made by some Apostle, he would not have failed to have told us of it. He declares on the contrary, that every one translated it as he was able. There is nothing therefore but the constant Tradition of the Church alone that gives authority to this Version, and that can oblige us to prefer it before the *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick* Copy of the *Nazarenes*.

Whereas the Protestants make the Holy Ghost to descend on the Apostles to translate the Gospel of *S. Matthew* out of *Greek* into *Hebrew*: some Catholick Divines on the other side pretend also that the ancient *Latin* Version of the New Testament hath been inspired. But it is much more reasonable only to admit this Inspiration for the Originals of the Holy Scriptures, which have been translated into different Languages according to the necessities and occasions of the Churches. If we hearken in the mean time to *Casaubon* and some other Protestants, the *Greek* only of *S. Matthew* would be accounted Canonical, (e) because the Church hath put this Text into the Canon that she hath made of the Sacred Books, and she hath

(d) *Que diversitas sententiarum, ut de vero autore certo pronuntiare nos vetat: ita illud certissime demonstrat, ipsis Apostolorum temporibus ab uno illorum, aut illorum auspiciis, vel potius Spiritus Sancti, cujus ipsi erant organa, Græcum Textum ex Hebraico esse confectum.* Casaubon. Exercit. 15. ad Annal. Baron. n. 12.

(e) *Constat sanè Ecclesiam Dei hunc ipsum textum inter libros Canonis Sacri relatum pari cum cæteris libris veneratione esse persecutam, quod neque in Syriacâ Versione, neque in ullâ aliâ reperitur esse factum.* Casaub. ibid.

not put therein the *Syriack* Version which is most ancient, nor any other Translation: but where is it to be found that the Church in placing the Gospel of *S. Matthew* in the rank of Canonical Books, hath spoken of the sole *Greek* Version, and hath excluded all others? She only speaks in general of the Gospel of *S. Matthew*, which is Divine and Canonical in whatsoever Language it be written. It may be said nevertheless that there are some Nations that have exacter Translations of them than others; this hinders not but that it may be averred, that they all have a Canonical Copy of the Gospel of *S. Matthew*. The *Grecians* and the *Latins* have this advantage over the other Christians, that their Versions are the most ancient and the most exact, and the *Syrians* after them. However there is no Christian Nation that doth not believe but that they have in possession the true Gospel of *S. Matthew*, tho they all have only Copies of it.

It doth not appear that *Casaubon*, who is usually moderate in his Opinions, hath sufficiently considered this matter, when he hath unadvisedly taken the part of some Protestants against *Baronius*. I do not pretend to defend all that *Baronius* hath alledged in this point: but it seems to me that those of the *Roman* Church cannot with Justice be reproached (f) as Hereticks, when they defend the *Hebrew* Text of *S. Matthew*, to detract (say they) from the Authority of the *Greek* Copy. The Defence that they undertake of the *Hebrew* Text of *S. Matthew* doth not in the least diminish the Authority of the *Greek* Version. They only insist that the *Greek* is not the original, but the *Hebrew*; and if this Original were come to our hands, it might with reason be preferred before the *Greek*, which is but a Translation. In the mean time since this *Hebrew* Text hath not been preserved in its purity in the Orthodox Churches, but on the contrary hath been adopted by the *Ebionite* Hereticks, who have corrupted it, the Fragments thereof that are now extant are looked upon as Apocryphal Pieces. By the word Apocryphal we ought only to understand that those Acts are doubtful, and not false, nor supposititious. This hinders not but that good use may be made of them in those parts that are acknowledged not to have been altered; an instance whereof hath been above propounded taken from *S. Jerome's* Commentaries on *S. Matthew*.

(f) Error est in fide periculosissimus, ne dicam Hæresis, obtentu Hebraici contextus, qui jam inde à principio reperiri desit in orbis nostri notis Ecclesiis, Græci auctoritatem velle elevare; quod omnes hodie Hildebrandinorum sacrorum mystæ in hac questione faciunt. Casaub. ibid.

It were to be wished that we had at this day this *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick* Gospel entire, even after the manner as it hath been interpolated by the *Nazarenes*, and altered by the *Ebionites*; we should not reckon it in the number of those Gospels that have been forged by Impostors, as *Casaubon* hath indiscreetly done: we should esteeme it on the contrary, as the most ancient Act of the Christian Religion. Is there not reason to conjecture that he that hath translated the Original of *S. Matthew* out of *Hebrew* into *Greek*, hath epitomized it in some places, and sometimes taken the liberty rather to give us the Sense than the Words? at least he seems to have used this liberty in the Quotations of the Old Testament that are therein produced, which are more conformable to the *Greek* Version of the Seventy, than to the *Hebrew* Text: in the mean while, there is very little appearance that *S. Matthew* writing his Gospel for the use of the *Hebrews*, who read the Bible in *Hebrew* in their Synagogues, should have quoted the Passages of the Old Testament otherwise than they were read in their Copies. It is sufficient to authorize this *Greek* Version, that it hath been read in the Churches that were constituted by the Apostles, and that it hath been delivered down to us from Age to Age by a constant Tradition: it is on this uninterrupted Tradition of the Churches that we ought to relye, in shewing that the *Greek* Copy of *S. Matthew* is authentick, and not on the imaginary Reasons of some Protestants.

This same Tradition of all the Churches in the World ought to be opposed to some Hereticks, who have believed that the Gospel of *S. Matthew* hath been mangled and corrupted in several places. *Fauftus*, a famous *Manichean*, who could not adjust the Genealogy of Jesus Christ that is at the beginning of *S. Matthew* to the Opinions of his Party, hath sought for Reasons to make it appear, that it was false; whereas he ought to have considered, that having been received continually in the Church, as well as the rest of this Gospel, it bore the same stamp of Authority: he compares *S. Matthew* with *S. Luke*, who have related this Genealogy in a different manner; and because (g) he could not make them agree, he abandons them to follow *S. Mark* and *S. John* who have made no mention thereof, and who correspond in this, that they do not make *Jesus* the Son of *David*; for *S. John* calls him God, and *S. Mark* the Son of God: from whence he concludes, that Jesus Christ was not born as *S. Matthew* and *S. Luke* have written.

(g) *Offensus duorum maxime Evangelistarum dissensione, qui genealogiam ejus scribunt, Lucae & Matthaei, hesi incertus quemnam potissimum sequeretur.* Apud Aug. lib. 3. cont. Faust. c. 1.

S. Augustin answers *Fauftus*, that he is not the first that hath taken notice of this seeming Contradiction of the two Evangelists: that an infinite number of learned Men, especially in the Greek Church, have spared no pains to reconcile them; which he endeavours to do in this place: and by this he condemns the rash Judgment of the *Manicheans*, who rejected as false, all that was contrary to their Prejudices. Indeed those People were so obstinate in their Opinions, that the same *Fauftus* reviled the Orthodox who received the Genealogy that is at the beginning of *S. Matthew*, as not being Catholicks, but Followers of *Matthew*; and he maintained also, that it was contrary to their Creed. *Quod si tu credas* (saith this Heretick) *ita ut scriptum est, eris jam quidem Matthæanus, sic enim mihi dicendum est; Catholicus vero nequaquam.* (b) You must either acknowledge (added he) that *St. Matthew* hath not written this Genealogy (which he called in derision *Genesidium*) or that you do not hold the Apostolical Faith.

Apud
Aug. l. 23.
cont.
Fauft. c. 2.

But it were an easie matter, without arguing at large on all the Difficulties that *Fauftus* propounded, to represent to him that this Genealogy had been always read in the Churches ever since the Apostles: besides, that (i) it was the Belief of the Catholick and Apostolick Church, (as *S. Augustin* saith) that *Jesus Christ* is the Son of God according to his Divinity, and the Son of *David* according to the Flesh: that this Truth was so clearly proved by the Writings of the Apostles, that they could not contradict it, at least if they did not reject them altogether.

By this same Principle the Arguments of certain Anabaptists, of whom *Sixtus Senensis*, and *Baronius* makes mention, might be confuted; but since their Objections are almost the same as those of the *Manicheans*, it would be to no purpose to insist on them. They have accounted as false that which *S. Matthew* hath related concerning the Wise Men that came to worship *Jesus* in the Cradle, as also the History of the Children whom *Herod* caused to be put to death: against the credit of these two Relations, they have opposed the silence of the other Evangelists, and of *Iosephus*, an Historian of that time.

(h) *De duobus vos unum fateri oportet, aut hunc non esse Matthæum qui hæc videtur asserere, aut vos non tenere Apostolicam fidem.* Apud Aug. lib. 23. cont. Faust. c. 22.

(i) *Fides Catholica eademque Apostolica est, Dominum nostrum & Salvatorem Jesum Christum, & filium Dei esse secundum Divinitatem, & filium David secundum carnem: quod ita probamus ex Evangelicis & Apostolicis literis, ut nemo possit contradicere, nisi qui ipsis literis contradicit.* Aug. lib. 23. cont. Faust. c. 3.

Sixtus

Sixtus Senensis replies judiciously, that by the same reason they ought not to believe the Resurrection of *Lazarus*, because none but *S. John* has spoken of it: neither doth the silence of *Iosephus* prove any thing; for he hath not mentioned divers other Actions, which nevertheless do not cease to be true. They that make such Objections as these, ought to alledge positive Proofs, as for example, from the diversity of ancient Copies, some of which they should produce wherein these Histories are not to be found; then they might infer with some probability that they had been added afterwards: but on the contrary they are to be seen in all our most ancient Records; and the greatest Enemies of the Christian Religion have cited them ever since the first Ages. *Celsus* hath read them in the Gospel after the same manner as we do at present. *Porphyrus* and *Julian* have also made some Objections against the Gospel of *S. Matthew*, or rather against all the Books of the New Testament: but we shall have occasion to examine them in the sequel of this Work.

*Sixt. Sen.
Bibl. S. l. 7.*

*Apud
Orig. l. 1.
cont. Cels.*

CHAP. X.

Of the Time and Order of every Gospel. Some Greek Manuscript Copies are produced thereupon. Of S. Mark and his Gospel, which is commonly believed to be the second. Of his Office of Interpreter to S. Peter.

ALthough some Ecclesiastical Writers have carefully set down the time in which they have believed that every Evangelist hath published his Gospel, we cannot nevertheless determine any thing thereupon. Because we have no ancient and certain Acts on which we might relye, I shall only relate what I have read on this Subject at the end of some Manuscript Copies: The most ancient of these Manuscripts that I have seen is at most but 700 Years old, as may be judged by the Character: it is written in great Letters with the Accents and Points, and may be seen in Mr. *Colbert's* Library, having been brought from *Cyprus*. There are also many in the King's Library, wherein the time in which every Evangelist hath written his Gospel is specified: but as I have just now said, these Manuscripts are not ancient. Indeed there are no such Remarks as these in the most ancient, the custom of those Primitive

times being only to put at the end of every Book of the New Testament, *The End of such a Book ; the beginning of this other Book.*

To return to the Manuscripts that contain the Dates of the Gospels, see that which is found in the Copy of Cyprus which is in Mr. Colbert's Library. (a) *The Gospel according to Matthew hath been published by himself at Jerusalem eight years after the Ascension of Jesus Christ.* This Word at Jerusalem is of a later Writing than the rest. (b) *The Gospel according to Mark hath been published ten years after the Ascension of Jesus Christ.* (c) *The Gospel according to Luke hath been published fifteen years after the Ascension of Jesus Christ.*

In another Copy that is in the King's Library, and contains all the New Testament, the Date of every Gospel is therein expressed after this manner in the beginning of them. (d) *The Holy Gospel according to Matthew, written in the Hebrew Tongue, hath been published at Jerusalem, and interpreted by John eight years after the Ascension of Jesus Christ.* (e) *The Gospel according to Mark hath been published ten years after the Ascension of Jesus Christ, and preached by Peter at Rome.* (f) *The Gospel according to Luke hath been published fifteen years after the Ascension of Jesus Christ, and preached by Paul at Rome.* (g) *The Gospel according to John hath been preached by himself in the Isle of Patmos thirty years after the Ascension of Jesus Christ.*

By this it may be seen what is the belief of the Greek Church touching the time wherein every Gospel hath been written : and though we cannot conclude any thing as from certain Acts, nevertheless we may infer from thence, that S. Mark obtains the second place amongst the Evangelists, if respect be had to the time in which they wrote : they are also placed in this order in a great number of Manuscript Copies which I have read : they are notwithstanding disposed otherwise in the Greek and Latin Copy of Cambridge, which

(a) Τὸ κτ' Ματθαίου εὐαγγέλιον ἐξεδόθη ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμοις μὲν χρόνους ἦ τ' τῷ Χριστῷ ἀναλήψεως. MS. Colb. n. 5149.

(b) Τὸ μὲν Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον ἐξεδόθη μὲν χρόνους δέκα τ' τῷ Χριστῷ ἀναλήψεως. Id. MS.

(c) Τὸ κτ' Λουκᾶν εὐαγγέλιον ἐξεδόθη μὲν χρόνους τε τ' τῷ Χριστῷ ἀναλήψεως. Id. MS.

(d) Τὸ κτ' Ματθαίου ἄρτον εὐαγγέλιον Ἐβραϊστὶ διαλέκτῳ γεγραπὸν ἐξεδόθη ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ' ἑβραϊσθῆν τ' ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου μὲν χρόνους ὀκτώ τ' τῷ Χριστῷ ἀναλήψεως. MS. Reg. n. 2871.

(e) Τὸ κτ' Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον ἐξεδόθη κτ' χρόνους δέκα τ' τῷ Χριστῷ ἀναλήψεως. ὑπογραφίσθη τ' ὑπὸ Πέτρου ἐν Ῥώμῃ. Id. MS.

(f) Τὸ κτ' Λουκᾶν εὐαγγέλιον ἐξεδόθη μὲν χρόνους τε τ' τῷ Χριστῷ ἀναλήψεως ὑπογραφίσθη τ' ὑπὸ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ. Id. MS.

(g) Τὸ κτ' Ἰωάννου εὐαγγέλιον ὑπογραφίσθη ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἐν Πάτμῳ τῇ νήσῳ κτ' χρόνους λ' τ' τῷ Χριστῷ ἀναλήψεως. Id. MS.

is one of the most ancient that we have at this day, and contains the four Evangelists, with the Acts of the Apostles. S. *John*, in this Copy follows immediately after S. *Matthew*, S. *Luke* after S. *John*, and S. *Mark* is the last of the four. This Order cannot be attributed to him that hath bound the Leafs of this Manuscript together; for the ranking of them is expressed at the end of every Gospel. See what is read at the end of S. *Matthew*, (h) *The Gospel according to Matthew is ended; the Gospel according to John beginneth*: afterwards it is read at the end of S. *John*, (i) *The Gospel according to John is ended, the Gospel according to Luke beginneth*: and at the end of S. *Luke* it is read, (k) *The Gospel according to Luke is ended, the Gospel according to Mark beginneth*: and lastly these Words are to be read at the end of S. *Mark*, (l) *The Gospel according to Mark is ended, the Acts of the Apostles begin*. This way of specifying the end of one Book, and the beginning of that which follows, is natural and the most ancient: there is no other to be found in the most ancient Manuscripts of the New Testament. The Manuscript Copy of the Epistles of S. *Paul*, which is in the Library of the *Benedictin* Monks of the Abby of S. *Germain*, and is not inferior in Antiquity, nor in the Beauty of its Characters, to that of *Cambridge*, ranketh the Epistles of S. *Paul* in order after the same manner; whereas in the Manuscripts that are of a later date, and in the printed Books, some other Circumstances have been added, that shew the place from whence these Epistles have been written, and the Persons by whom they have been sent. Moreover, the order of the Gospels which the *Cambridge* Manuscript follows is not peculiar to it; for it may be seen also in an ancient Catalogue of the Books of the Holy Scriptures which is at the end of the before mentioned MS. Copy of the *Benedictines*. It is probable that this Alteration hath been made by the *Latins* who have transcribed the *Greek* Copies for their use. *Druthmar*, an ancient *Benedictin* Monk, declares that he had seen a Copy like to that of *Cambridge*, wherein the Gospel of S. *John* immediately followed after that of S. *Matthew*: and it was believed, that this Copy heretofore belonged to S. *Hilary*.

Christ.
Druthm.
Expos. in.
Matth.
cap. 1.

But this different Disposition in point of order of the Copies of the Gospels, doth not interfere with the general Opinion of the Ec-

(h) 'Ευαγγέλιον καὶ Ματθαῖον ἐτελέσθη, ἀρχεται εὐαγγέλιον καὶ Ἰωάννου. MS. Cantabrig.

(i) 'Ευαγγέλιον καὶ Ἰωάννου ἐτελέσθη, ἀρχεται εὐαγγέλιον καὶ Λουκᾶ. Id. MS.

(k) 'Ευαγγέλιον καὶ Λουκᾶ ἐτελέσθη, ἀρχεται καὶ Μάρκον. id. MS.

(l) 'Ευαγγέλιον καὶ Μάρκον ἐτελέσθη, ἀρχεται ἀποστόλων. Id. MS.

clesiastical Writers, who all give the second place among the Evangelists to *S. Mark*. It is also commonly believed, that he was only the Disciple of the Apostles, and that therefore he could not be an Eye-witness of the Actions which he relates: he hath only published that which he had learn'd from them, more especially from *S. Peter*, whose Interpreter it is affirmed that he hath been. *Marcus* (saith *S. Irenæus*) *interpretes & sectator Petri*; as if *S. Peter* had only preached this Gospel, and that it had been afterwards written by *S. Mark*. This Opinion is very ancient; for *Papias*, who had received it from one of the Disciples of the Apostles, declares it after him in these Words: (*m*) *Mark, who was Peter's Interpreter, hath written exactly all that he had retained in his memory, without observing the order of the Words and Actions of Jesus Christ; for he had not himself heard Jesus Christ, not having followed him; but he had followed Peter, who preached to the People according as their necessities required, without taking care to put the Words of our Saviour in order. Therefore Mark cannot be accused of any fault, who hath recorded some Actions as they came into his mind. He hath applied himself solely not to forget any thing that he had heard, and to say nothing but what was true.*

This Testimony of *Papias* confirms that which hath been above-said, that the Gospels are only Collections of the Preachings of the Apostles, that have been committed to Writing without having too scrupulous a regard to the times when those Actions happened which are related therein. Indeed, these sacred Writers have made it their business rather to exhibit a true History, than exactly to describe the circumstances and order of Time: *Clement Alexandrinus* informs us moreover, that *S. Peter* publicly preached the Gospel at *Rome*; and that *S. Mark*, who for a long time followed this Apostle, put it in Writing at the request of the Faithful of that place: he adds also, that (*n*) *S. Peter* having known it, did neither dissuade him from it nor exhort him to it. *Eusebius* nevertheless relying on the Authority of the same *Clement*, will have it, that *S. Peter* after he had been informed of the great Zeal that the Faithful of *Rome*

Euseb. Hist.
Eccles. l. 2.
c. 15.

(*m*) Μάρκος ὁ ἐρμηνεύτης Πέτρου ἡγουμένῳ, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν· ὃ μὲντοι τίθει τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λαμβάνοντα ἢ παραχρῆντα· ὅτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τὸ κρεῖν, ἔτε παρεκλήθησεν αὐτῷ ὕστερον ὅ ὡς ἔρην Πέτρου, ὃς ὡς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας· ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν ὧν κλειανὸν ποιούμενῳ λόγων· ὥστε ἔδιν ἡμῶν Μάρκος, ὅπως ἐνία γράφας ὡς ἀπὸ μνημόνευσεν· ἐνθ' ὃ ἐποίησαντο πένοντο, τὸ μνηδὲν ὃν ἤκουσε παραλίπῃν, ἢ ἀδυνατῇ π' ἐν αὐτοῖς. *Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 39.*

(*n*) Ὅσοι ἐπαγγόντα τὸ Πέτρον πρὸς τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν μὴ καλῶσαι μὴ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν· *Clem. Alex. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. c. 14.*

testi-

testified to have his Preachings in Writing, approved of the Collection that S. Mark had made of them; to the end that being authorized by himself, it should be read in the Churches.

S. Jerom hath only copied and epitomized after his manner the Words of Eusebius, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, where he saith, in speaking of S. Mark, *Marcus Discipulus & Interpres Petri juxta quod Petrum referentem audierat rogatus Romæ à fratribus, breve scripsit Evangelium: quod cum Petrus audisset, probavit, & Ecclesie legendum sua autoritate dedit.* The Author of the Synopsis of the Holy Scriptures hath also believed that S. Mark hath only published the Preachings of S. Peter: (o) *The Gospel according to Mark (saith he) hath been preached at Rome by the Apostle Peter, and hath been published by the blessed Apostle Mark, who hath also preached it at Alexandria in Egypt, in Pentapolis and in Lybia.* In a word, it hath been the Judgment of all Antiquity after Papias, who was contemporary with the Disciples of the Apostles, that the Gospel of S. Mark is only a Collection of the Preachings of S. Peter, whose Interpreter he was; and the most part of the Fathers have avouched at the same time, that it was made at Rome, at the entreaty of the Primitive Christians of that City.

Papias, nevertheless, saith nothing of the place in the Passage that we have above cited; and S. Irenæus speaks of it a little otherwise than the other Fathers; he declares that S. Mark wrote not his Gospel till after the Death of S. Peter and S. Paul; at least this is the most natural sense that can be given to his Words, according as they are set down in the ancient Latin Edition of the Works of this Father: observe what he saith, *Matthæus in Hebræis ipsorum lingua Scripturam edidit Evangelii, cum Petrus & Paulus Romæ Evangelizarent, & fundarent Ecclesiam. Post verò horum excessum, Marcus Discipulus & Interpres Petri, & ipsa quæ à Petro annuntiata erant per scripta nobis tradidit.* Eusebius hath rehearsed in Greek these very Words of Irenæus. Feuardent, in his Edition of the Works of this Father, hath observed that these words *post horum excessum*, are not found in Eusebius: but he may be convinced of the contrary by the Greek of Eusebius, where there is $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi\acute{\omicron}\tau\omega\tau\omega\nu\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$, which the ancient Interpreter of S. Irenæus hath translated *post horum excessum*, and Rufinus, *post quorum exitum*. That which hath deceived Feuardent is the Error of Christophersoni, who hath left them out in his Latin Version, having thought that it should be read in the Greek $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi\acute{\omicron}\tau\omega\tau\omega\nu\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$, quo edito.

(o) Τὸ ἅγιόν Μάρκον ἐναγγέλιον ἡσυχάζοντι μὲν ὑπὸ Πέτρῳ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ, θετέον δὲ ὑπὸ Μάρκου τῷ μαθητῇ ἀποστόλου, καὶ ἐκπεύχοντι ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ, καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ ἐν Πενταπόλει, καὶ Λιβύῃ. Athanas. in Synopf. S. Script.

If this reading were grounded on any Manuscript Copies, without doubt it ought to be preferred before the other: but *Christopher-son* seems to have corrected this place on purpose in his Translation, to reconcile *S. Irenæus* with the other *Greek* Fathers; which ought never to be done; for if it were permitted to alter the Text of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers in those places where they do not agree, especially where they treat of Chronology and the Designation of Times, we must of necessity cast them into a new model: therefore *Jacobus Grymæus* hath judiciously re-established this Passage in the Edition which he hath set forth with his Amendments of *Christopher-son's* Version: he hath put in the body of the Translation *post obitum autem illorum*, and in the Margin these *Greek* Words *ὑποστασιν*, to shew that it must be read so, and not *ὑποστατον*. *Valesius* hath also followed this same reading in his History of *Eusebius*, and he hath put in his *Latin* Version *post horum interitum*. He reprehends also, in his Notes on this place, the Translation of *Christopher-son*, as being contrary to all the *Greek* Copies, and to *Ruffinus*. We may observe in the mean time, that the *Greek* Word *ὑποστασιν*, and the *Latin* *Excessus* or *Exitus*, which the ancient Interpreter of *S. Irenæus* and *Ruffinus* have used, is equivocal; for it signifieth *Departure* as well as *Death*. According to the first sense, *S. Irenæus* would have only said, that *S. Mark* published his Gospel after *S. Peter* and *S. Paul* were departed from *Rome*.

St. John Chrysostom hath believed contrary to the Judgment of most part of the Fathers, that *S. Mark* hath written his Gospel in *Egypt*, and not at *Rome*; nevertheless, he doth not ground his Opinion on any ancient Acts, but only on this, That it was commonly said so, viz. (p) that as *S. Matthew* had composed his Gospel at the Suit of the *Jews* whom he had converted to the Faith of *Jesus* Christ, and that desired to have his Preachings in Writing; in like manner *S. Mark* had written his Gospel at the Request of his Disciples in *Egypt*. This seems so much the more probable, in regard that the Apostles and their Disciples were wholly employed in preaching the Gospel, and that they never would have thought of committing their Preachings to Writing, if they had not been pressed to do it by the People whom they instructed. I doubt not that *S. John Chrysostom* hath had respect to this general Maxim of the Apostles and their Disciples, and that he hath considered that

(p) Αἰγύπτῳ δὲ καὶ Μάρκος ἦν ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ πεδονῶντων σεμιναρίων αὐτῶ καὶ παρακαλοῦντων, ἅτε εἴπε διὰ ῥημάτων, ταῦτα εἶναι διὰ γεγραμμάτων αὐτοῖς, καὶ τῷ ἦν Ἐλεσίῳ φωνῇ συνθεῖναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· καὶ Μάρκος δὲ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἦν μαθητῶν παρακαλοῦντων αὐτὸν τὸτο ποιῆσαι. Joann. Chrysost. Homil. 1. in Matth.

S. *Mark* hath been the first Apostle of *Egypt*; not but that the Opinion of this learned Bishop might be easily reconciled with that of the other Fathers, in saying that S. *Mark* hath delivered his Gospel to the Faithful of *Rome* in quality of Interpreter of S. *Peter*, who preached the Religion of Jesus Christ in that great City; and that he hath also given it afterwards to the Primitive Christians of *Egypt* in quality of Apostle or Bishop. We cannot however determine any thing hereupon but in general, because we have no certain Acts whereon we may confide. Therefore it is no wonder that the Fathers do not agree amongst themselves when they speak in particular of such Transactions as these, having oftentimes nothing to relye on but Conjectures.

S. *Augustin* seems to have considered S. *Mark* only as it were an *Abbreviator* of the Gospel of S. *Matthew*. *Marcus* (saith this Father) *Matthæum subsequutus, tanquam pedissequus & breviator ejus videtur*. Indeed if we compare these two Gospels together, we shall find not only the same things, but also the very same expressions, which S. *Mark* sometimes epitomizeth, as if he had designed only to make an Abstract of the Gospel of S. *Matthew*. This would seem to prove that this last had been written in *Greek*, and not in *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick*; at least it might be said that the *Greek* Version of S. *Matthew's* Gospel was already published when S. *Mark* composed his. *Grotius* is of a different Persuasion, viz. that (q) S. *Mark* hath made use of the *Hebrew* Gospel of S. *Matthew*, and that afterwards he that translated the latter out of *Hebrew* into *Greek* hath followed the *Greek* Copy of S. *Mark*, whose dialect or way of speaking he hath only mollified, as being somewhat harsh, and too near the *Hebrew*, suiting it to the Genius of the *Greek* Tongue. But we can expect nothing but Conjectures herein.

It is worth the observing, that S. *Mark* cannot pass for a simple *Abbreviator* of S. *Matthew*, because he insists more at large than he doth in some places; besides, if he had only a design to publish an Epitome of S. *Matthew's* Gospel, he would not have taken away the entire Genealogy of Jesus Christ, which makes one of the most principal parts of it: it is not the custom of those that epitomize the Works of others, to retrench the most considerable parts of them. And we must take heed of this, lest we unadvisedly authorize the

(q) *Sicut autem Marcus usus est Matthæi Hebræo ni fallor codice; ita Marcus libro Græco usus mihi videtur quisquis is fuit Matthæi Græcus interpres. Nam quæ Marcus ex Matthæo desumpserat, idem hic iisdem propè verbis posuit, nisi quod quadam à Marco Hebræico aut Chaldaico loquendi genere expressa propius ad Græci sermonis normam emolliovit.* Grot. Annot. in tit. Matth.

Opinion of the *Ebionites* and *Manicheans*, who would have the Genealogy which is at the beginning of *S. Matthew* and *S. Luke*, to be added afterwards by some later Writers, who had (as they said) revised and interpolated these two Gospels.

*Epist. 2.
ad Cor.
c. 7. v. 6.*

*Joseph.
Antiq.
l. 20. c. ult.
Bar. Ann.
c. 45 n. 34.*

The Office of Interpreter to *S. Peter*, which the ancient Doctors of the Church have unanimously attributed to *S. Mark*, admits of some difficulties; for how could it be (may it be objected) that this Apostle who had received of the Holy Ghost the gift of Tongues, should have need of an Interpreter either in Writing or in speaking in public? But there is nothing very surprizing in this: *S. Paul*, who was very well skill'd in the *Greek* Tongue, because he had learned it from his Youth at *Tarsus*, where it was spoken, did not forbear to take *Titus* for his Interpreter. Therefore *S. Jerom* expounding these Words of this Apostle, *God that comforteth those that are cast down, comforted us by the coming of Titus*, declareth, (r) that the Joy that *S. Paul* had in the Presence of *Titus* sprang from this, that in his Absence he was not able to preach the Gospel as he desired, because *Titus*, who was his Interpreter, and spake *Greek* more fluently than he, served him as an Organ to promulge the Gospel of *Jesus Christ* to the People. (s) He ascribes to *S. Paul* all possible knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and of divers Languages, but he could not (saith he) express the Majesty of the Divine Oracles after so noble and eloquent a manner as he wished; which obliged him to take *Titus* for his Interpreter, as *S. Peter* also made choice of *S. Mark* for the same Function. We know that *Josephus*, who understood the *Greek* Tongue perfectly, and had diligently studied it, saith of himself, that it was impossible for him to pronounce it well, by reason of his Mother Tongue. *Baronius*, who hath considered this Example of *Josephus*, could not, nevertheless, absolutely give his Suffrage to *S. Jerom*. (t) He is persuaded, that the Apostles who have received from God the gift of Tongues, have not received them imperfect; and that therefore they knew as well how to pronounce the *Greek* as the *Hebrew*: insomuch that he is obliged to have recourse to another sort of Interpreters, of whom mention is made

(r) Ergo & Paulus contristatur, quia prædicationis suæ in præsentiarum fistulam organumque per quod Christo caneret non invenerat. Hier. Epist. ad Hedib. qu. 11.

(s) Cumque Paulus haberet scientiam sanctarum scripturarum, & sermonis diversarumque linguarum gratiam possideret, unde ipse gloriatur in domino — divinarum sensuum majestatem digno non poterat Græci eloqui explicare sermone; habebat ergo Titum interpretem, sicut & B. Petrus Marcum. Hieron. ibid.

(t) Quod pertinet ad Apostolos, cum unà cum cæteris Linguis & Græcam fuerint divinitus affecti, Deique dona perfecta sint, eos nihilominus Græcam linguam eâ facilitate quâ Hebræam pronuntiasse, mihi facile persuadeo. Baron. ann. c. 45. n. 34.

in the first Epistle of *S. Paul* to the *Corinthians*. Whereas there were sometimes Persons of different Nations and Languages in the Primitive Assemblies of Christians, it was necessary that there should be Interpreters, who might explain to them in their own, what the Apostles delivered in the vulgar Tongue of the Country. It is certain that the Church of *Corinth* mentioned by *S. Paul*, was composed of divers *Jews* who spake *Chaldaick* or *Syriack*: and this seems to have given occasion to all this Discourse of *S. Paul* touching the gift of Prophecy and that of Tongues. This holy Apostle excludes none from the Assembly; he permits those that had no knowledge of the Language of the Place to speak in their own proper Dialect, though it were not understood by the others: he only requires them in this case to make use of an Interpreter, according to the Custom of the Synagogues at that time. Greater is he that prophesieth (saith he) than he that speaketh with Tongues, except he interpret that the Church may receive edifying.

Epist. 1. ad Cor. cap. 14.
Epist. 1. ad Cor. c. 14. v. 5.

But it is evident that *Papias* and the other ancient Ecclesiastical Authors, did not intend to describe this sort of Interpreters, when they said that *S. Mark* had been the Interpreter of *S. Peter*. *Baronius* himself hath believed that *S. Peter* had written his Epistles in *Hebrew* or *Syriack*, and that they had been afterwards put into *Greek*: he insinuates, that *S. Mark* who was his Interpreter translated the first. However it be, I see no reason that can hinder us from affording to *S. Peter* and the other Apostles who did not perfectly understand the *Greek* Tongue, the use of true Interpreters, either in speaking or writing. It is in this sense that all Antiquity hath given to *S. Mark* the Title of Interpreter to *S. Peter*.

Baron. ann. c. 45. n. 19.

CHAP. XI.

In what Language St. Mark hath written his Gospel. Of the twelve last Verses of this Gospel, which are not found in several Greek Manuscript Copies.

Cardinal *Baronius* hath forgot nothing in his Annals that might serve to prove that *S. Mark*, who was the Interpreter of *S. Peter* at *Rome*, hath written his Gospel in *Latin*: he confesseth nevertheless, that *S. Jerom* and *S. Augustin* are of a different Opinion. But he might have said, that all Antiquity hath believed with one ac-

Opinion of the *Ebionites* and *Manicheans*, who would have the Genealogy which is at the beginning of *S. Matthew* and *S. Luke*, to be added afterwards by some later Writers, who had (as they said) revised and interpolated these two Gospels.

*Epist. 2.
ad Cor.
c. 7. v. 6.*

*Ioseph.
Antiq.
l. 20. c. ult.
Bar. Ann.
c. 45 n. 34.*

The Office of Interpreter to *S. Peter*, which the ancient Doctors of the Church have unanimously attributed to *S. Mark*, admits of some difficulties; for how could it be (may it be objected) that this Apostle who had received of the Holy Ghost the gift of Tongues, should have need of an Interpreter either in Writing or in speaking in public? But there is nothing very surprizing in this: *S. Paul*, who was very well skill'd in the *Greek* Tongue, because he had learned it from his Youth at *Tarsus*, where it was spoken, did not forbear to take *Titus* for his Interpreter. Therefore *S. Jerom* expounding these Words of this Apostle, *God that comforteth those that are cast down, comforted us by the coming of Titus*, declareth, (r) that the Joy that *S. Paul* had in the Presence of *Titus* sprang from this, that in his Absence he was not able to preach the Gospel as he desired, because *Titus*, who was his Interpreter, and spake *Greek* more fluently than he, served him as an Organ to promulge the Gospel of *Jesus Christ* to the People. (s) He ascribes to *S. Paul* all possible knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and of divers Languages, but he could not (saith he) express the Majesty of the Divine Oracles after so noble and eloquent a manner as he wished; which obliged him to take *Titus* for his Interpreter, as *S. Peter* also made choice of *S. Mark* for the same Function. We know that *Iosephus*, who understood the *Greek* Tongue perfectly, and had diligently studied it, saith of himself, that it was impossible for him to pronounce it well, by reason of his Mother Tongue. *Baronius*, who hath considered this Example of *Iosephus*, could not, nevertheless, absolutely give his Suffrage to *S. Jerom*. (t) He is persuaded, that the Apostles who have received from God the gift of Tongues, have not received them imperfect; and that therefore they knew as well how to pronounce the *Greek* as the *Hebrew*: insomuch that he is obliged to have recourse to another sort of Interpreters, of whom mention is made

(r) Ergo & Paulus contristatur, quia prædicationis suæ in præsentiarum fistulam organumq; per quod Christo caneret non invenerat. Hier. Epist. ad Hedib. qu. 11.

(s) Cumque Paulus haberet scientiam sanctarum scripturarum, & sermonis diversarumque linguarum gratiam possideret, unde ipse gloriatur in domino — divinarum sensuum majestatem digno non poterat Græci eloquii explicare sermone; habebat ergo Titum interpretem, sicut & B. Petrus Marcum. Hieron. ibid.

(t) Quod pertinet ad Apostolos, cum unâ cum cæteris Linguis & Græcam fuerint divinitus affecuti, Deique dona perfectâ sint, eos nihilominus Græcam linguam eâ facilitate quâ Hebræam pronuntiassent, mihi facile persuadéo. Baron. ann. c. 45. n. 34.

in the first Epistle of *S. Paul* to the *Corinthians*. Whereas there were sometimes Persons of different Nations and Languages in the Primitive Assemblies of Christians, it was necessary that there should be Interpreters, who might explain to them in their own, what the Apostles delivered in the vulgar Tongue of the Country. It is certain that the Church of *Corinth* mentioned by *S. Paul*, was composed of divers *Jews* who spake *Chaldaick* or *Syriack*: and this seems to have given occasion to all this Discourse of *S. Paul* touching the gift of Prophecy and that of Tongues. This holy Apostle excludes none from the Assembly; he permits those that had no knowledge of the Language of the Place to speak in their own proper Dialect, though it were not understood by the others: he only requires them in this case to make use of an Interpreter, according to the Custom of the Synagogues at that time. Greater is he that prophesieth (saith he) than he that speaketh with Tongues, except he interpret that the Church may receive edifying.

*Epist. 1.
ad Cor.
cap. 14.*

*Epist. 1.
ad Cor.
c. 14. v. 5.*

But it is evident that *Papias* and the other ancient Ecclesiastical Authors, did not intend to describe this sort of Interpreters, when they said that *S. Mark* had been the Interpreter of *S. Peter*. *Baronius* himself hath believed that *S. Peter* had written his Epistles in *Hebrew* or *Syriack*, and that they had been afterwards put into *Greek*: he insinuates, that *S. Mark* who was his Interpreter translated the first. However it be, I see no reason that can hinder us from affording to *S. Peter* and the other Apostles who did not perfectly understand the *Greek* Tongue, the use of true Interpreters, either in speaking or writing. It is in this sense that all Antiquity hath given to *S. Mark* the Title of Interpreter to *S. Peter*.

*Baron. an.
c. 45. n. 29.*

CHAP. XI.

In what Language St. Mark hath written his Gospel. Of the twelve last Verses of this Gospel, which are not found in several Greek Manuscript Copies.

Cardinal *Baronius* hath forgot nothing in his Annals that might serve to prove that *S. Mark*, who was the Interpreter of *S. Peter* at *Rome*, hath written his Gospel in *Latin*: he confesseth nevertheless, that *S. Jerom* and *S. Augustin* are of a different Opinion. But he might have said, that all Antiquity hath believed with one ac-

cord, that S. *Mark* hath composed his Gospel in *Greek*, and that the Author of the Lives of the Popes is the first that hath written the contrary. As for S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, whose Testimony this Cardinal produceth as if it were favourable to his Opinion; he only saith, that S. *Mark* hath published his Gospel for the *Latins*, and not in *Latin*. Therefore the Jesuit *Maldonat* (a) frankly declares, that if we except S. *Matthew* who hath written in *Hebrew*, the ancient Ecclesiastical Authors do all agree, that the other Evangelists have written in *Greek*.

It is true that we read at the end of S. *Mark* in the *Syriack* Version, that he hath preached his Gospel in *Latin* in the City of *Rome*. But it is sufficiently known of what Authority these Inscriptions can be, which are at the beginning and at the end of the Sacred Books, especially in the Oriental Versions. I account as nothing the *Arabick* and *Persian* Translations wherein the same is read, because they have been made from the *Syriack*. That which hath misled the *Syrians*, is their believing, as Cardinal *Baronius* hath done after the Writer of the Lives of the Popes, that S. *Mark* could not have written his Gospel at *Rome* otherwise than in the Language of the Country, having composed it at the request of the Faithful of that City who spake *Latin*. (b) It cannot be imagined (saith he) that the Apostles should have preached the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the Nations in any other Languages but those that were in use amongst them. He hath not taken notice that S. *Peter* came to *Rome* to preach the Gospel to his own Country-men; and that therefore S. *Mark* ought to have published it in a Language that was most known to them. Now it is certain that the *Jews* who were dispersed throughout the whole *Roman* Empire, and even the greatest part of those that were then at *Rome*, understood the *Greek*; and that there were very few, on the contrary, that had any knowledge of the *Latin* Tongue. This hath been very judiciously observed by *Grotius* in the beginning of his Notes on S. *Mark*; *Judæi* (saith this learned Critick) *qui Romæ agebant plerique Latini sermonis ignari, longâ per Asiam & Græciam habitatione Græcam linguam didicerant, & Romanorum vix quisquam erat non Græce intelligens.*

Grot. An-
not. in tit.
Marci.

This may be sufficient to answer all the Reasons alledged by *Baronius*, who could not apprehend how S. *Mark*, who exercised the

(a) *Constantissima autem apud omnes veteres auctores fuit opinio, ceteros quidem Græcè, Mattheum verò Hebraico scripsisse sermone. Mald. Præf. in 4 Evang. c. 5.*

(b) *Neminem puto existimaturum Apostolos, cum gentibus prædicarent Evangelium, aliis usos fuisse linguas ab his quibus gentes illæ uterentur, quibus Dei verbum annuntiarent. Baron. ann. c. 45. n. 37.*

Function of an Interpreter at *Rome*, should speak and write in any other Language but the *Latin*. It is certain (saith this Cardinal) that *S. Peter* spake at *Rome* in the Language of the *Romans*; how then could it come to pass that *S. Mark* the Interpreter should have translated the Preachings of this holy Apostle out of *Latin* into *Greek*? If it be said (adds he) that *S. Peter* spake *Greek* or *Hebrew*, *S. Mark* could not have interpreted his words but in *Latin*. All this arguing proves nothing, if we consider that *S. Peter* spake to the *Jews* at *Rome* in a Language which they understood, and that *S. Mark* hath collected the Preachings of this Apostle in the same, at the desire of those *Jews* that were lately converted.

Baronius adds to all these Reasons another proof which is taken from the style of *S. Mark*; he affirms that they that have any knowledge of the *Greek* Tongue may easily judge that he hath written his Gospel in *Latin*, because several improper Words are found therein which are not in the least *Greek*, but *Latin* Grecified. He thereupon quotes Cardinal *Sirlet*, who hath made an exact Collection of them; from whence at last he concludes, (c) that the Reasons which he hath produced to make it appear that *S. Mark* hath written in *Latin*, are so strong and cogent, that they seem to be Demonstrations.

These Reasons on the contrary cannot but appear very weak to those who are versed in the Criticism of the Sacred Books. If this last proof concluded any thing, it would conclude at the same time that the other Evangelists have also written in *Latin*, because the like Expressions are found in their Gospels, that is to say, *Latin* words Grecified. It might be proved moreover after this manner that the *Syriack* and *Arabick* Versions of the Bible had been first composed in *Greek*, and afterwards translated into *Syriack* and *Arabick*, because there are in these Translations many *Greek* words that have been Syriacised and Arabified. It is no wonder that *S. Mark*, who is supposed to have written in *Greek* at *Rome*, should have made use of *Latin* words Grecified. Since it is the custom of all Nations that speak a foreign Language to mingle with it some of their own words, and so *S. Mark* would have spoken *Greek*, as it was spoken at *Rome*, and even in many other Cities of the Empire, where the *Grecians* had adopted divers *Roman* words.

If it were true that the very Original of *S. Mark* is at this day kept at *Venice*, as they of this Country do avouch, all this Dispute

(c) *Hic igitur propè necessariis rationibus non solum suademur, sed obstricti sermone devincimur atque planè cogimur affirmare, Evangelium Marci ab eo Latine potius quàm Græcè esse conscriptum.* Baron. ann. Ch. 45. n. 44.

would

would be quickly ended; but *Baronius* had no mind rashly to give credit to a popular Tradition that had no Foundation in Antiquity. *Ciaconius*, who hath written the Lives of the Popes, speaks but doubtfully concerning this question; he durst not pronounce magisterially as *Baronius* hath done, that *S. Mark* hath written in *Latin*, tho he cites the Archives of the *Venetians*, who pretend to have the true Original in their possession. He chiefly relies on the testimony of the *Syrians*, and on this, that it is improbable that a Gospel should have been written in any other but the *Latin Tongue*, that was made for the use of the *Latins*. Notwithstanding this he leaves the matter undetermined. *Marcus* (saith this Historian) *Petri discipulus & sectator, & in baptismo filius, Evangelium, quod ipse Apostolorum princeps prædicaverat, Romanorum hortatu & precibus Græcè itidem conscripsit, seu, ut alii volunt, Latine, cujus eâ linguâ archetypum adseruari putant Venetii in Marcianis thesauris. Syri omnes huic rei fidem faciunt, & ratio suadet, ut non alia quàm Latinâ Linguâ Evangelium in usum Latinis futurum conscriberetur. Alterutrum horum sit, &c.* One would think, to hear this Author speak, that *S. Mark* had only composed his Gospel for the *Latins*. On this account I do not wonder that the Original thereof is kept at *Venice* in the Treasury of *S. Mark*.

*Alfons.
Ciaccon.
Vit. Sum.
Pontif.
edit. Rom.
ann. 1601.
in Petro.*

It remains for us to examine the twelve last Verses of this Chapter, which are not found in several *Greek Manuscript Copies*. *S. Jerom* who had seen a great number of these Manuscripts, declares in his Letter to *Hedibia*, that there were in his time very few *Greek Copies* wherein they were read: *Omnibus Græciæ libris penè hoc capitulum non habentibus*. We must not understand, as the most part of Commentators on the New Testament have done, by this word *Capitulum* that is in *S. Jerom*, the last Chapter of *S. Mark* entire, but only from these words of the ninth Verse, *ἀναστὰς δὲ, &c.* to the end, as it appears by the Manuscript Copies which I have above consulted; and it shall be shewn in the Sequel of this Work, that the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers have denoted quite another thing by the word *Capitulum*, Chapter, than what we now mean at this day by the Chapters of the New Testament, and also of the whole Bible.

*Hieron.
Epist. ad
Hedib.
qu. 3.*

*Grot. An-
not. in c.
16. Marci.*

Grotius hath believed with many other Authors, that it is not possible that *S. Mark* should have omitted in his Gospel the entire History of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. He cannot also imagine that it hath been written, and lost afterwards, insomuch that that which we read at present is only a Supplement made by a later Writer. It is not credible (saith he) that this should have happened to a Book of which so many Copies have been made as soon as it was published. Besides, he that is supposed to have added this

Supplement

Supplement would have followed *S. Matthew*. He adds farther that the *Latin*, *Syriack* and *Arabick* Copies, as also *S. Irenæus*, who is a most ancient Witness, do all confirm this Chapter. He confesseth nevertheless that it was not found in some *Greek* Copies from the time of *S. Gregory Nyssen*. Lastly he judgeth for the Reasons that we have now related, that this defect in the *Greek* Copies ought to be attributed to the Transcribers, who not being able to make that which this Evangelist saith touching the Resurrection of Jesus Christ conformable to *S. Matthew*, have taken away from *S. Mark* all this History. Indeed the Emperor *Julian* hath opposed to the Christians the contradiction of their Gospels in this place; and there have been Learned Writers among the *Grecians* who have composed Works on purpose on this Subject to reconcile them.

Maldonat (d) on the contrary could not admit the Opinion of those that ascribe this defect in the *Greek* Copies to the Transcribers, who could not make this Place of *S. Mark* agree with *S. Matthew*, because if this reason were good, they ought to have done the same thing, with respect to the last Chapter of *S. Luke*, and the last Chapter but one of *S. John*, which differ yet more from *S. Matthew* in this point, than *S. Matthew* doth from *S. Mark*. Major enim (saith this Learned Jesuit) inter illos & *Matthæum*, quam inter *Matthæum* & *Marcum*, apparet repugnantia. (e) Moreover he admires that *S. Jerom* who hath took so much pains in observing the diversity of the Copies, hath applyed himself so little to establish the Authority of this Chapter, which cannot be affirmed not to belong to the Gospel of *S. Mark*.

The harsh manner of expression that the same *S. Jerom* hath used in discoursing of these twelve last Verses of *S. Mark* hath yet more offended *Batonius*, who could hardly believe that he should let fall such words as seemed to destroy the Authority of this last Chapter. This Learned Father in answering *Hedibia*, who had desired him to reconcile the Evangelists in the matter of the Resurrection of our Saviour, saith (f) that this difficulty might be resolved two several ways; the first of which is, that this Testimony

Baron. an.
Ch. 34.
n. 134.

Hieron.
Epist. ad
Hedib.
qu. 3.

(d) Quod nonnulli repugnantiam, quæ inter Marcum hoc loco & Matthæum videtur esse, causam putant ejusmodi suspitioni tribuisse, absurda prorsus est ratio. Mald. Comm. in c. 16. Marci.

(e) Magis etiam miror non majore Hieronymum studio ejus auctoritatem asseruisse, quod nulla prorsus conjectura sit ullâ ex parte probabilis fuisse ad Marci Evangelium adjectum. Mald. ibid.

(f) Hujus questionis duplex est solutio: aut enim non recipimus Marci testimonium quod in variis fertur Evangeliiis, omnibus Græciæ libri pend hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus, &c. Hieron. Epist. ad Hedib. qu. 3.

of

of *S. Mark* might be rejected as being found but in a very few *Greek* Copies.

Baronius useth his utmost endeavours to shew even by the authority of *S. Jerom* himself, that there is no reason to suspect that this last Chapter hath been added afterwards to the Gospel of *S. Mark*. He opposeth to this Father his own words in his second Book against the *Pelagians*, wherein he observes, that in some *Greek* Copies there was a long addition at the end of the Gospel of *S. Mark*, which he also produceth. From whence this Cardinal concludes, that even according to the Report of *S. Jerom*, this Chapter now in dispute was not only in the *Greek* Copies, but that there were also some found wherein an Addition had been inserted; and takes an occasion thereupon to correct the words of this Father in his Letter to *Hedibia* (g) where he ought not to have said, (if we may believe *Baronius*) that this last Chapter was wanting in some *Greek* Copies, but only that a considerable Addition had been annexed to them, which said Addition (according to his opinion) might come from the *Manicheans* who had altered some Copies of the Scriptures. Lastly he infers from the Premises, that the Church hath amended these *Greek* Copies from the *Latin*. *Quamobrem Dei Ecclesiam adinstar Latinorum correxisse Græcorum exemplaria certum est.* And after all these Reasons (b) he sharply reproves Cardinal *Cajetan*, because he doubted, being induced thereto by the Testimony of *S. Jerom*, of the verity of the last Chapter of *S. Mark*.

Baron. ib.

But after all, I think that *Cajetan* might have been treated more mildly, who hath entertained a doubt on the sole authority of *S. Jerom*, concerning the verity of this last Chapter, before the Council of *Trent* had determined any thing thereupon, because this Father hath grounded his Judgment on divers Copies that he had read. I find moreover that *Baronius* hath only copied *Sixtus Senensis* without thoroughly examining this matter: If he had consulted the ancient *Greek* Copies he would not have took so much liberty to correct *S. Jerom*'s Remark on the twelve last Verses of this Chapter: for this Father hath very well distinguished these Verses which he mentions in his Letter to *Hedibia*, from this other Addition of which he discourseth in his second Book against the *Pelagians*. And there-

(g) Pro eo quod dicere debuisset, in Græcis codicibus Marci ultimum caput quibusdam auctum reperiri, illud ipsum in iis desiderari dixisse. *Baron. ann. Chr. 34. n. 185.*

(h) Hec quidem omnia si comperta satisque explorata habuisset quidam ex recentioribus, nequaquam adeo temerè in re tantà Catholico homine indignam tulisset sententiam, dicens ultimum Marci capitulum non esse solide auctoritatis ad firmandam fidem. *Baron. ibid.*

fore the Observation of *Sixtus Senensis* (i) who urgeth that *S. Jerom's* words can only be understood of certain Apocryphal Periods which had been adjoynd to some *Greek Copies* by uncertain Authors, is very far from truth. It is sufficient only to read the words of this Reverend Doctor as well in his Epistle to *Hedibia*, as in his Work against the *Pelagians*, to judge that he speaks apparently in those two places of two different Additions. And that there may remain no doubt thereof, I shall here produce what I could observe on this Subject in reading the ancient *Greek Copies*.

It is to be supposed, as hath been above said, that the question is not concerning the whole last Chapter of *S. Mark*, but only the twelve last Verses. This is that part which *S. Jerom* hath called *Capitulum Chapter*, wherein is described the History of the Resurrection. The most ancient *Greek Copy* of the Gospels of those that are in the King of France his Library, contains after these words *ἰησοῦς ὁ*, this Remark written as the rest of the Text, and wit^h the same Hand, * *ῥέρεται περὶ καὶ ταῦτα*, it is read in some places as followeth: * *ῥέρεται Πάντα ὅτι τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς ἀπὸ τὸν Πέτρον σωτῆρος ἐγγύσειαν* καὶ ὅτι ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ ἀναπαύσεως καὶ ἄλλης δύσεως ἐξαπέστειλεν δι' αὐτῶν τὸ ἐρεῖν καὶ ἀφάρτον κήρυγμα τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας. They declared in a few words to those that were with Peter all things that had been commanded them; and afterwards Jesus himself published by their Ministry this holy and incorruptible preaching of eternal Salvation.

Ex cod.
MS. Bibl.
Reg. n.
2361.

There follows afterwards in this Manuscript this Observation written in the Body of the Book, and with the same Hand as the Text * *Ἐστὶ καὶ καὶ ταῦτα παρηγγέλια καὶ τὸ ἰησοῦς ὁ*. After these words *ἰησοῦς ὁ* is found that which followeth *ἀναστὰς ὁ*, &c. to the end of the Gospel. We may easily judge by this, that they that have written this *Greek Copy* which is ancient, have believed that the Gospel of *S. Mark* ended at these words *ἰησοῦς ὁ*. They have nevertheless added the rest written with the same hand, but only in form of a Remark, because it was not read in their Church, which is altogether conformable to the Testimony of *S. Jerom* in his Letter to *Hedibia*. Since this diversity is considerable, it is necessary for me to make some Reflections thereon, grounded on this ancient Manuscript of the King's Library.

(i) *Quod autem subtexuit Hieronymus, olim caput istud in Græcis exemplaribus non fuisse, & ob id ab aliquibus rejectum, eo quod aliis Evangelistis videretur contraria continere, non de totâ hujus capituli scripturâ intellexit, sed de quibusdam apocryphis capituli hujus periodis ab incertis auctoribus in quibusdam codicibus immissis, quæ quia vel dubiæ, vel aliis Evangelistis contrariæ viderentur, idcirco à Patribus de Græcis codicibus subductæ sunt. Quod ipse D. Hieronymus lib. 2. adv. Pelag. declarat. Sixt. Sen. Biblioth. S. lib. 7.*

Bez. An-
not. in
c. 16. Mar-
ci v. 9.

It seems that *Beza* hath seen this Manuscript, or at least one like it; for he saith in his Notes on *Mark* xvi. that he hath found in one Copy these words added, πάντα ὃ τὰ περιγλυφία, and the rest, as hath been above related. But he ought to have explained himself more distinctly thereupon, and to have observed that this Addition was written in the Manuscript only in form of a *Schotion* or Note, and not as belonging to the Text of *S. Mark's* Gospel. This appears manifestly in the Manuscript of the King's Library.

We ought to judge after the same manner of this other Addition which *S. Jerom* declares that he hath read in some *Greek* Copies, and which he publisheth in these terms. *In quibusdam exemplaribus, & maxime in Græcis codicibus, juxta Marcum in fine ejus Evangelii sic scribitur*: "Postea cum accubuissent undecim, apparuit eis Jesus, & exprobravit incredulitatem & duritiem cordis eorum, quia iis qui viderant eum resurgentem non crediderunt. Et illi satisfaciebant dicentes: Seculum istud iniquitatis & incredulitatis substantia est, quæ non finit per immundos spiritus veri Dei apprehendi virtutem. Idcirco jam nunc revela justitiam tuam. This hath been apparently taken out of some Apocryphal Gospels, as we have above seen a like Addition taken from that of the *Nazarenes*. The *Greek* Transcribers thinking thereby to make their diligence and exactness more apparent have inserted them into their Copies. But they have done it by way of Remark; and there have been others afterwards who have left these Additions in the Text, without annexing any thing that denoted that they were only as it were Observations: because these Additions were not read in their Churches, they did not think these little Notes necessary.

By this same method we may justify the Observation of *S. Jerom* in his Letter to *Hedibia*, wherein he declares that the last Chapter of *S. Mark*, that is to say, the twelve last Verses were not read in the greatest part of the *Greek* Copies. *Beza* on the contrary (*k*) protests that this Chapter is found in all the old Manuscripts that he hath read; but he hath not regarded, that altho it be found in the ancient *Greek* Manuscripts, yet there are many of them in which it is written only as it were an Addition that doth not appertain to the Text. This evidently appears in the King's ancient Manuscript above-cited. For tho these words ἀνστήσις, &c. and the rest to the end of the Gospel be written therein with the same Hand as the whole Body of the Book, nevertheless the Remark that is adjoyned makes it plainly appear, that they that have written this Copy have not considered them as

(k) Testor in omnibus vetustis codicibus quos nobis videre contigit hoc caput inveniri. Bez. Annot. in cap. 16. Marci, v. 9.

part of the Text. It is to be observed moreover, that the Sections are marked in the Margin of the Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament by the Letters of the Alphabet, which serve instead of Numbers or Figures. These Marks are in the first Editions of the Greek New Testament of *Erasmus*, in *Robert Stephen's* Edition in *Folio*, and in some others. Now there are none of these found in the King's Manuscript over against these twelve Verses, which is a proof that they were not read in their Church that have transcribed this Copy. This will appear yet more clearly in the Sequel of this Discourse, wherein I shall explain the use of these Marks or Sections in the Greek Copies of the New Testament.

Euthymius who hath made Learned and Judicious Annotations on the New Testament, confirms all this that we have just now acknowledged, and justifieth at the same time *S. Jerom's* Observation in his Letter to *Hedibia*. See what he saith on these words of *S. Mark*, ἐφ' οὗτο δ, Chap. xvi. 9. (1) *Some Interpreters say that the Gospel of S. Mark is ended here, and that that which follows is a later Addition. We must nevertheless explain this also, because it containeth nothing contrary to the truth.*

There is also another Manuscript Copy of the Gospels in the King's Library, ancient enough, and written very exactly, wherein is also read this Observation on the same Passage ἐφ' οὗτο δ, (m) *The Evangelist ends here in some Copies; but in many the following words are found, ἀναστὺς δ, and the rest to the end of the Gospel.* The little Sections are marked in this Copy over against these last Verses, as well as in the rest of the Gospel; which proves that they were read in that Church for whose use it was written. And there is annexed to it a *Synaxarion* or *Lectionary* that contains in order the Gospels of the whole year, and the day on which this Gospel was to be read. I have also seen another Copy in *Monfieur Colbert's* Library, which was written with a great deal of care, wherein this same Note is found after these words ἐφ' οὗτο δ, and is expressed in the same Terms.

Ex Cod.
MS. Bibl.
Colb. n.
2467.

It seems to me that these Observations that are grounded on good Greek Manuscript Copies are more than sufficient to justify the Critical Remark of *S. Jerom* in his Letter to *Hedibia*, on the twelve

(1) Θεοὶ Νίπης καὶ Ἑβραίων ἐνταῦθα συμπληρῶσαι τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον. τὰ δ' ἐφ' οὗτο δ, οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἀλλοιῶς ἀντιγραφέν. καὶ δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἐκ μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀντιγραφέν. *Euthym.* in cap. 16. *Marci*, ex cod. MS. Biblioth. Reg. n. 2401.

(m) Ἐν ποσὶ καὶ ἀντιγραφέν ἐως οὗτο δ, καὶ ταῦτα ἐκ πολλοῦ καὶ ἐν ταῦτα ἐκ πολλοῦ, ἀναστὺς δ, &c. MS. Reg. n. 2868.

last Verses of the Gospel of *S. Mark*. It must needs be that in his time they were not read in the most part of the *Greek Churches*. This Father nevertheless doth not believe that they ought to be absolutely rejected; for he endeavours in this Epistle to reconcile *S. Mark* with *S. Matthew*, after the same manner as *Euthymius* doth; and after he hath taken notice that some Interpreters of the New Testament have thought that those words have been added, he forbears not to expound them however, whether they belong to *S. Mark's* Gospel or not.

*Ex Cod.
Bibl. Reg.
n. 1834.*

*Iren. adv.
Her. lib. 3.
c. 11.*

But notwithstanding all these Reflections, we ought by no means to doubt of the verity of this Chapter, which is as ancient as the Gospel of *S. Mark*. Therefore the *Grecians* do all generally read it at this day in their Churches, as may be proved by their *Lectionaries*, one of which in Manuscript is kept in the King's Library. This Manuscript indeed is not ancient, but it is magnificent and hath served some Church of *Constantinople*. Neither can we find a more ancient Testimony than that of *S. Irenæus*, who lived before all this happened that hath been produced concerning this difference of the *Greek Copies*. This Father cites in express words the end of the Gospel of *S. Mark*: *In fine autem* (saith he) *Evangelii ait Marcus*: "Et quidem Dominus Jesus, postquam locutus est eis, receptus est in Cælo, & sedet ad dextram Dei. He quotes in this Passage the nineteenth Verse of the last Chapter of this Gospel; and the whole Chapter contains but twenty.

Lastly, there is no diversity in the most ancient *Latin Copies*, nor in the *Syriack*; whereby it may be proved that this Chapter was read in the *Greek Copies*, from whence these Versions that are very ancient, especially the *Latin*, have been taken. It is found also in the *Cambridge Copy*, and in that which is called the *Alexandrian*, which are the two most ancient *Greek Manuscripts* of the Gospel that we now have in *Europe*.

CHAP. XII.

Of the Gospel of S. Luke ; what hath obliged him to publish it, since there were two others that had been written before his. Of Marcion, and his Copy of S. Luke's Gospel. The Catholicks have also altered this Gospel in some places.

AS it hath been the general Opinion of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, that S. Mark hath collected his Gospel from the preachings of S. Peter, whose Interpreter he was; in like manner, they have also believed that S. Luke, who hath followed S. Paul in his Travels, hath done nothing else but gathered together the preachings of this Holy Apostle. (a) Luke (saith S. Irenæus) who followed Paul, hath committed to Writing the Gospel which he preached. This Luke, (if we give credit to the Testimony of these ancient Writers) is he of whom S. Paul speaks in his Epistle to the Colossians, where he saith, *Luke, the beloved Physician, greeteth you.* The Author of the Synopsis of the Holy Scriptures bestows on S. Luke the Titles of *Epist. ad Colof. c. 4. v. 14.* (b) *Blessed Apostle and Physician*; and he adds, that he hath published the Gospel that had been preached by S. Paul. We ought not, nevertheless, to place him in the same rank with the true Apostles of Jesus Christ, as having been no more than their Disciple: he declares himself, in the beginning of his Gospel, that he hath only undertook to write what he had learned from those who had been eye-witnesses of the things which he related. Therefore Tertullian (c) doth not call him an Apostle, but an Apostolical Person; he speaks after the same manner of S. Mark, (d) who (according to his Opinion) was but the Disciple of the Apostles.

S. Luke, in the Introduction to his History, protests that he would write nothing but what he had received from very good Information: indeed his design was to divert the Christians from the

(a) Λουκᾶς ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου τὸ ὑπὸ ἐμῶν κηρυσσόντων εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βελτίᾳ κατέγραψε. Iren. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 8.

(b) Τὸ καὶ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγέλιον καταγράψαι μὲν ὑπὸ Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὡς ἡμεῖς οἴομεθα καὶ ἡ ἐξῆσθαι ὑπὸ Λουκᾶ τοῦ μαθητοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ ἰατροῦ. Athan. in Synopsi Script. S.

(c) Lucas non Apostolus, sed Apostolicus, non magister, sed discipulus. Tertul. lib. 4. adv. Marc. c. 2.

(d) Ex Apostolicis Lucas & Marcus. Ibid.

reading.

Luc. i. 2.

reading of some false Gospels that had been published in his time: and since it might have been opposed against him, that not having been himself a Witness of the Actions which he related, he was not endued with Qualifications necessary to an Historian, he immediately prevents this Objection in the Preface to his Gospel, where he assures us, that he hath avouched nothing but what had been faithfully reported to him by Persons that had seen those things with their own eyes. This hath caused S. Jerom to say, (e) that S. Luke had written his Gospel on that which he had heard, and that he had composed the Acts of the Apostles on that which he had seen himself. S. Irenæus hath also observed, (f) that this Evangelist had truly related that which he had learned from the Apostles.

Hieron.
Proöm.
Comm.
in Matth.

Baron. an.
c. 58. n. 32.

We do not certainly know the time when S. Luke wrote his Gospel: Grotius conjectures, after some other Authors, that he published it with the Acts of the Apostles, a little after S. Paul had departed from Rome to go into Spain, because his History of the Acts ends about that time. If we believe S. Jerom in this Point, he composed it in Achaia, when S. Paul travelled into that Country. In Achaia Bæotizæque partibus volumen condidit. Baronius makes use of the Authority of this Father to confute Euthymius and several other Writers, who have affirmed that S. Luke had written fifteen Years after the Ascension of our Saviour; which time is also set down at the end of many Greek Manuscript Copies. This cannot be (saith Baronius) because it is certain that neither S. Luke nor S. Paul have been in Achaia at that time, nor even a great while after.

In the mean time, we have no certain Acts from whence we may exactly gather the time of the Publication of this Gospel by S. Luke: we only know in general, that the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers do all agree that it was not written till after those of S. Matthew and S. Mark. This being granted, it may be demanded what reason he had, who was only a Disciple of the Apostles, to publish a third Gospel, knowing that S. Matthew, who was an Apostle, and a Witness of the most part of the Actions of Jesus Christ, had already published one, which had been epitomized by S. Mark? These two Gospels were then in the hands of all the Christians; What necessity was there that S. Luke should make a new one, and that he should give notice in his Preface, that they who had written before him on this same Subject were not very accurate?

(e) *Evangelium sicut audierat scripsit, Acta verò Apostolorum sicut viderat ipse composuit.* Hieron. de Script. Eccles. in Luca.

(f) *Lucas nemini invidens ea quæ ab Apostolis didicerat tradidit nobis.* Iren. adv. Hær. l. 3. c. 14.

This

This hath given occasion to some Authors to believe, that the Gospels of *S. Matthew* and *S. Mark* had not been yet published when *S. Luke* composed his: but since this Opinion is contrary to all Antiquity, *Baronius* insists that these two Gospels, one of which was in *Hebrew* and the other in *Greek*, were not then known to the *Grecians*, and that consequently *S. Luke* and *S. Paul* could not make use of them in their Instructions. *Grotius* also thinks, that (g) *S. Matthew* had not been as yet translated out of *Hebrew* into *Greek*: and as for *S. Mark*, he confesseth that his Gospel was in *Greek*; but since it was only an Epitome, this could not hinder *S. Luke* from writing his History. But it is not probable that the Gospel of *S. Matthew* should have been unknown till then to the Christians that spake the *Greek* Language; especially if we follow the Judgment of these two Writers, who give it out that *S. Luke* had not composed his History till after *S. Paul* had left *Rome*.

It is much more credible, that this Evangelist published his History upon occasion of some false Apostles who were set up in opposition to *S. Paul*, whose faithful Companion he was. It is a part of Prudence to obviate, as much as is possible, present Evils; therefore *S. Luke*, seeing that false Gospels had been dispersed in those Places where he preached with *S. Paul*, thought himself obliged to compose a true one, and to leave it in Writing to those whom he had instructed: whereas the business in hand was only to suppress and stop the course of false Gospels that had been scattered abroad; this had no regard to *S. Matthew* and *S. Mark*. It might also happen that he had compiled this Gospel at the desire of those whom he had converted, and more especially of *Theophilus*, to whom he dedicates it. It is certain that the other Evangelists, as hath been already observed, have written their Histories only at the suit of those People to whom they had preached the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Marcion and his Followers, who in the time of *Epiphanius* were dispersed through *Italy*, *Egypt*, *Palestine*, *Syria*, *Arabia*, *Persia*, and many other Countries, acknowledged none but the Gospel of *S. Luke*; they had, nevertheless, retrenched divers Passages of it: Besides, the Name of this Evangelist was not at the head of their Copy; whether it were that they received it in this manner, or that they did not believe it to be made by *S. Luke*, *S. Irenæus*

(g) Credibile est ad id tempus Matt bæi librum nonnisi sermone Hebræo extitisse. Marcus autem Græcè compendium magnæ historiæ, quàm historiam scripserat. Grot. Annot. in Præf. Luc.

(b) re-

(b) reproves these Hereticks for having altered according to their humor the Scriptures which the Church had authorized, as being founded on a constant Tradition; and for accounting no part of S. Luke's Gospel and of the Epistles of S. Paul as legitimate, but that which they had reserved, after they had taken away from these Books whatsoever they pleased. And since they contradicted in this all the Tradition of the Churches, (i) he affirms, that these Sectaries who boasted that they had a Gospel, have none.

Epist. ad Gal. c. 2. Tertullian hath written a Work on purpose against Marcion, (k) whose Disciples gave it out that their Master had not brought any Innovation into Religion, in separating the Law from the Gospel, but that he had only rectified the Rule of Faith which was corrupted. This Arch-Heretick, who followed the Opinions of Cerdon, (l) rejected the Law and all the Prophets; and to authorize their Novelties, they supported themselves with the Words of S. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, where this Apostle saith, that he had withstood Peter and some other Apostles to the face, because they did not walk uprightly according to the Truth of the Gospel. Marcion, (m) had taken occasion from thence to reform and even to destroy the true Gospels, to give more Authority to his own. Tertullian answers him, that he could not charge the Apostles with corrupting the Gospels, without accusing Jesus Christ at the same time, who had chosen them: he adds, (n) That if Marcion acknowledged that their Gospel had been entire, but that it was interpolated by false Apostles, and that this imperfect Copy was now in use; he ought at least to shew which was the true and original Gospel that had been corrupted: lastly, he demands of Marcion how it could

(h) Marcion, & qui ab eo sunt, ad intercidendas conversi sunt scripturas. Quasdam quidem in totum non cognoscentes, secundum Lucam autem Evangelium & Epistolas Pauli decurtantes, hæc sola legitima esse dicunt quæ ipsi minoraverunt. Iren. adv. Hær. l. 3. c. 12.

(i) Hi qui à Marcione sunt non habent Evangelium: hoc enim quod est secundum Lucam decurtantes gloriantur se habere Evangelium. Iren. ibid.

(k) Aiunt Marcionem non tam innovasse regulam separatione Legis & Evangelii, quam retrò adulteratam recurasse. Apud Tertul. l. 4. adv. Marc. c. 3.

(l) Ἀπελάλξεν τὸν νόμον καὶ πλείους τοῦ αἰσχροῦ. Epiph. Hær. 42. n. 4.

(m) Committitur ad destruendum statum eorum Evangeliorum quæ propria & sub Apostolorum nomine eduntur, vel etiam Apostolicorum, ut scilicet fidem quam illis adimit suo conferat. Tertull. lib. 4. adv. Marc. c. 3.

(n) Si verò Apostoli quidem integrum Evangelium contulerunt, Pseudapostoli autem veritatem eorum interpolaverunt, & inde sunt nostra digesta, quod erit germanum illud Apostolorum quod adulteros passum est — aut si tam funditus deletum est, ut catachismo quodam ita invidatione falsariorum oblitteratum, jam ergo nec Marcion habet verum. Tertull. ibid.

happen

happen that he should have the true Gospel, if it had been so falsified by Impostors that there was nothing of it left?

Tertullian moreover establisheth the true Gospel of *S. Luke* on the universal Consent of the Churches that were planted by the Apostles, and of other Churches that derived their Original from them: all these Churches preserved the Copy of *S. Luke* in the same condition as it had been published from the beginning; whereas that of *Marcion*, on the contrary, was hardly known; or if it were known it was at the same time condemned: he relieth also on this same Tradition of the Churches in representing to *Marcion*, (o) that he had no reason out of all the Gospels to select that of *S. Luke*, and to neglect the others, as if they were not to be esteemed, and as if they had not been as generally received in all the Churches ever since their first Foundation. *Tertul. ib. c. 5.*

He comes afterwards to some particular Passages that *Marcion* had taken away from his Gospel: He charges him with having retrenched that place where Jesus Christ saith that he was not come to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but rather to fulfil them: but this Objection appears to be ill grounded; for these Words are to be found only in *S. Matthew's* Gospel, which was not owned by *Marcion*. *Tertullian* seems here to have confounded *S. Luke* with *S. Matthew*, when he read in *S. Luke's* Gospel that which is not therein at present. He objects to him in the second place, that he had taken away from the Gospel these other Words, *I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel*. This Passage is also found in *S. Matthew* only, and not in *S. Luke*; which may induce us to believe that these two Objections of *Tertullian* have respect to the Gospel in general, as if he had supposed that *Marcion* had no reason to receive one Gospel more than another: but then he would have proved nothing directly against his Adversary. It might be that *Tertullian's* Copy was not exact, and that the Lessons of several Gospels had been blended together: Since *S. Epiphanius* hath much more accurately treated on this matter, and hath carefully examined the Passages that *Marcion* had altered in his Copy of *S. Luke*, we shall here produce the particular Remarks of this Father, that we may have a better knowledge of the Gospel of the *Marcionites*.

Marcion had not in his Gospel all the beginning of *S. Luke* to these Words, *in the fifteenth year of the Reign of Tiberius Cæsar*; that is to

(o) *Et de his Marcion flagitandus, quod omissis eis Luca potius instruxerit, quasi non & hæc apud Ecclesias à primordio fuerint quemadmodum & Luc. Tertull. ibi cap. 5.*

say, he had cut off the two first Chapters of our Edition; neither did he read as we do at this day, the Particle δ which signifies *now*, and hath some relation to that which proceeds. S. Epiphanius adds, (p) that besides the Passages which this Heretic had taken away from his Gospel, he observed no Order nor Coherence, and that he had also inserted some Additions, which he describes in particular. See the Alterations that he hath remarked, on which I shall make some Reflections.

In the fifth Chapter of S. Luke, and the fourteenth Verse, where we read $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\sigma\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$, for a testimony unto them, Marcion read, $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\sigma\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\acute{\upsilon}\nu$, that this may be a testimony unto you; making that to fall on them that were healed by Jesus Christ, which relates to the Priests in our Copies. Moreover, S. Epiphanius reads in this same place after $\alpha\epsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\epsilon$ the word $\delta\omega\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, an Offering, which was not in Marcion's Copy no more than in the greatest part of ours: but this diversity is of no importance, the sense being always the same, after whatsoever manner we read it; and it could not happen but from the Transcribers, who have omitted or added it.

Chap. 16. v. 17. $\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (or $\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$, as S. Epiphanius read it) $\mu\epsilon\lambda'$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, being come down with them. Marcion read, $\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$, he came down in them. This may be also a various reading that doth not alter the sense; it may be an *Hebraism* commonly used in the Sacred Books: the Particle $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ may signify in this place the same thing as the Particle $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ in *Hebrew*, to which the Greek $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ answers; now the Particle $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ signifieth indifferently *in*, and *with*. Therefore it ought not to be translated here (as Father Petau would have it) *he came down in them*; but according to the *Hebraism*, *he came down with them*: this sort of *Hebraisms* is found in S. Luke as well as in the other Evangelists.

Chap. 8. v. 19. $\eta\ \mu\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\epsilon\ \omicron\iota\ \alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, his Mother and his Brethren. Marcion did not read these Words in his Copy, but only in the beginning Verse, $\mu\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\ \kappa\epsilon\ \omicron\iota\ \alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota\ \kappa\epsilon$, thy Mother and thy Brethren. This doth not appear nevertheless to be a vicious Alteration, since these Words being repeated, the sense will remain always the same, though they be read but once: it is possible then that Marcion might read it so in his Copy without altering it.

Chap. 9. v. 40. and 41. Marcion did not read in his Copy these Words, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\delta\upsilon\eta\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\upsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\epsilon\ \alpha\epsilon\theta\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\delta\ \eta\gamma\omega\alpha\ \alpha\mu\epsilon\varsigma\ \theta\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\iota$. They could not cast it out, and he said unto them, O faithless Ge-

(p) Οὐ καθ' εἰρμὸν πάλιν ἐπιβλέψας, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν παρεκλήθει, τὰ δὲ προσέειπεν ἀνθρώποις, ὡς ὁρῶντας βαλίζων, ἀλλὰ ἐπαρρησιμῶν πάντα αἰνεῖν διὰ. Epiph. Har. 42. D. 11.

neration, how long shall I suffer you? S. Epiphanius reads it thus, but Marcion's way of reading it is more concise; however the sense is preserved. It may be that he thought the other Words superfluous, and would not put into the mouth of Jesus Christ speaking to his Disciples, this expression that seemed harsh to him, *O faithless Generation*. He ought not in the mean time to have corrected this Passage according to his own Conceptions, and without being supported by good Copies.

Chap. 10. v. 21. where we read, *I thank thee, O Father, Marcion* had not in his Copy the Word *πάτερ, O Father*. S. Epiphanius affirmeth that it ought to be read, because it is repeated in the following Verse: he saith moreover, that Marcion had retrenched it only (q) that it might not be proved from this Passage, that Jesus Christ had called his Father *δημιουργός* or Creator. But this Repetition seems rather to shew that this Heretick had not maliciously taken away from his Copy the Word *πάτερ, O Father*; for whether we read it or not, the sense is not changed. Marcion had not also in his Copy, *ὃς ἐκ γῆς καὶ τοῦ κόσμου, and of Earth, but only, Lord of Heaven*.

Chap. 11. v. 29 and 30. Marcion had taken away from his Gospel all that is said in this place concerning *Jonas*, reading only these Words *ὅτι ἡμεῖς αὐτὸν σημεῖον ἰδοῦσιν αὐτῷ, there shall be no sign given to this Generation*. He did not read also the two following Verses, wherein mention is made of the Queen of the South, of Solomon, and the *Ninivites*.

In this same Chapter, v. 42. where it is in our Copies *κρίνον, Judgment*, Marcion had in his *κλήνον, Vocation*. This Epiphanius condemns as a vicious Alteration, and made on purpose, because the following Words shew clearly that it ought to be read *κρίνον* and not *κλήνον*. It might be, nevertheless, that the little difference that there is between these two Words in the Greek hath caused this diversity of reading, and that Marcion had retained this fault of the Transcriber in his Copy.

He did not read also in his Copy in the 49 Verse of this same Chapter these Words, *Διὰ τὸ τοῦτο ἐγὼ ἔπεμψα ὑμῖν προφῆτας, Therefore also said the Wisdom of God, I will send them Prophets*. Now since he rejected the Prophets, it is not to be doubted but that he hath retrenched this Passage from his Copy, that hath so clearly established them: neither did he read these other Words which are in the same place, v. 51. *ἐκζητηθήσονται αὐτὸν ἡμεῖς ταῦτας, it shall be required of this Generation*.

(q) ὅτι αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔμελλεν αὐτὸν ἀποδοῦναι τὸν σημεῖον. Epiph. ibid.

Chap. 12. v. 6. He had not in his Copy these Words, Οὐχὶ πάντα
 σπυρίδια ἀσπαρίγων δύο πωλεῖται; καὶ ἐν ἑξ ὧν ἓκ ἐκ ἐπὶ ἀπληθυνόμενον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.
Are not five Sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is for-
gotten before God.

In the same Chapter, v. 8. instead of these Words ἄγγέλων τοῦ
 Θεοῦ, *the Angels of God*, Marcion read only τοῦ Θεοῦ, *God*. This might
 be an Omission of the Transcriber that doth not interrupt the sense
 in this place; nevertheless, S. Epiphanius accuseth Marcion of Infi-
 delity and Prevarication as much in this minute title as in any other
 Alteration of greater consequence; because (r) *he that durst alter*
any thing of that which hath been written from the beginning, is not in
the way of truth.

He did not read these words of the 28 Verse of the same Chap.
 ὁ Θεὸς ἀμφένυσται τὴν χλόην, *God clotheth the grass*; and in the 32 verse,
 where we have it πατὴρ ὑμῶν, *your Father*, he read it simply, πατὴρ,
Father. In the same Chapter, ver. 38. instead of these Words διδ-
 οτὶς ἢ τρίτη φυλακὴ, *in the second or third watch*, he read, ἑσπερινὴ φυλακὴ
in the evening watch.

Marcion had also expunged out of his Copy the three first Verses
 of the 13 Chapter, and especially these words of the fifth Verse,
 Ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσατε πάντες ὁμοίως ἀπολείδετε, *Except ye repent, ye shall all like-*
wise perish.

In the same Chapter, Verse 28. in place of these words, Τότε ὁ-
 ραίσετε Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ πάντας τοὺς προφῆτας ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ,
then ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the Prophets
in the Kingdom of God; Marcion had put these, Τότε πάντας δικαίους ἰδοῦτε
 ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους, *then you shall see all the just in*
the Kingdom of God, and you your selves thrust out. He adds, (saith
 S. Epiphanius) κεραιμένους ἔξω, *detained without*, and these other words,
 καὶ ἐκεῖ ὄσιν ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς καὶ ὁ ὀδόντων, *there is weeping and gnashing*
of teeth. These last words are not an Addition, but a Transpositi-
 on; for the same words are found in our Copies at the beginning
 of this Verse: besides, whereas S. Epiphanius reads τότε ὁ-
 ραίσετε, it ought to be read ὅταν ὁ-
 ραίσετε. This Father, who quotes the Scriptures accord-
 ing to his Memory, or applies them to his present Discourse, doth
 sometimes change the words into others, or abbreviate them; and
 this is to be observed likewise in other places. The true difference
 of Marcion's Copy consists in the Word προφῆτας, *Prophets*, which he
 hath changed into that of δικαίους, *just*; and he hath added κεραι-
 μένους ἔξω, *detained without*, without altering the sense.

(r) Ὁ πολὺς γὰρ π πωρρολοσιν ἢ γλυσμμένων ἀπαρξῆς ἐκ ἐν ὁδῷ ἀληθείας.
 Epiph. ibid.

Marcion had taken away divers other words of this Chapter out of his Copy: viz. I. These words of the twenty ninth Verse ἡξουσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, *They shall come from the East, and from the West, and shall sit down in the Kingdom.* II. These of the thirtieth Verse, οἱ ἔσχατοι ἔσονται πρῶτοι, *The last shall be first.* III. These words of the thirty first Verse, περιήλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι λέγοντες, ἔξελθε καὶ πορεύου, ὅτι Ἡρώδης σε θύλει σκοτεῖναι, *There came certain of the Pharisees, saying unto him, Get thee out, and depart hence, for Herod will kill thee.* IV. The whole thirty second Verse, and part of the thirty third Verse to these words, ὅτι ἔκ ἐνδύχεται, *For it cannot be.* And from the thirty fourth Verse he had cut off these Words, Ἰερουσαλὴμ, Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἡ ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ λιθοβολῶσα τοὺς ἀποσταλμένους, *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the Prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee.* And these other words of the same Verse, πόλλας ἠθάρωσα διππυγάζαι τὰ τέκνα σου, ὡς τρέφυ ὄρνις, *How often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen.* These words from the thirty fifth Verse, ἀρίσται ὑμῶν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν, *Your house is left.* And lastly he had retrenched these other words from the same Verse, καὶ μὴ με ἴδωτε ἕως ἃν ἦξῃ ὅτι εἴπωτε, εὐλοῖσθαι. *Ye shall not see me, until the time come when ye shall say, blessed is,*

This Heretick had cut off from his Gospel the whole Parable of the prodigal Son; which is in the fifteenth Chapter; as also these words; chap. 17. vers. 10. λέγει ὅτι δεῖται ἀχρεῖοι ἑσμεῖν· ὅτι ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἀποδοτε τοῖς ποσὶν ποιήσασθαι. *Say, we are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.* He had taken away a little after in the same Chapter several parts of the Passage wherein mention is made of the Lepers that met Jesus Christ. See what he reads in that place, Ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς λέγων· δεῖξτε αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἱερεῶσι. *He sent them away saying, shew your selves to the Priests.* He had in like manner altered divers other Circumstances in this History, where he read, Πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐν ἡμέραις Ἐλισαίου τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ ἐκ ἐκασταίου εἰ μὴ Νεεμαν τοῦ Σύρου. *There were many lepers in the time of the prophet Eliza, and none were cleansed except Neeman the Syrian.*

Chap. 18. vers. 19. After these words, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθόν, *None is good save one,* Marcion added, ὁ πατήρ, *the Father*; and at the twentieth versé instead of οἶδας, *thou knowest*, he read ἴδω, *I know*. He had also retrenched the thirty first Verse of this same Chapter, and these words from the thirty second and thirty third Verses, ἀποκτανθήσεται, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήσεται. *He shall be delivered, he shall be put to death, and the third day he shall rise again.*

Cap. 19. (1) he had expunged out of his Copy that which be-

(1) Παρέκοψεν τὸ κεφάλαιον τὸ ὄν, καὶ Βηθσαζά, καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν· Eriph. ibi. longs.

longs to the History of the arrival of Jesus Christ at the Mount of Olives, which was near Bethphage, and all that which is related in this same Chapter, concerning the Ass on which our Saviour rode when he made his entry into Jerusalem, as also the other Verses wherein mention is made of the Temple.

Chap. 20. He left out of his Copy the whole Parable of the Vineyard that was let forth to Husbandmen, beginning at the ninth Verse, and ending at the sixteenth. He had also taken away these words of the seventeenth Verse, *Τὸ ἐν ᾧ τὸ γεγραμμένον ἔσται, λίθον ἐν ἀπειθείᾳ οἱ οἰκοδομῶντες*, *What is this then that is written, the stone which the builders rejected*, &c. He had in like manner retrenched the thirty seventh Verse, and a part of the thirty eighth in which the Resurrection of the dead is declared.

Chap. 21. Vers. 18. These words, *Θεὸς ἐν τῇς κεφαλῇς ὑμῶν ἡ μὴ ἀπολείπεται*, *There shall not an hair of your head perish*, were not in his Copy, nor these other words of the twenty first Verse, *Ὅτι οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φεγγύουσιν εἰς τὰ ὄρη*. *Then let them which are in Judea, flee to the Mountains*: nor the rest of this History, which he had expunged because of these words of the thirty second verse, *ὥς ἂν πάντα πληρῇ*, *till all be fulfilled*.

Chap. 22. He had not in his Copy the sixteenth Verse of this Chapter, nor the thirty fifth and thirty sixth Verses, because of these words of the thirty seventh Verse, *ἔτι τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεθῆναι*, *This that is written must yet be accomplished*: nor these other words that are in the same place *καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἰλογίσαν*, *And he was reckoned among the transgressors*. He had also retrenched that which is said of S. Peter in the fiftieth Verse, when he cut off the ear of one of the Servants of the High Priest.

Chap. 23. Verse 2. To these words *ἔστων ἕνεκα διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος*, *We found this fellow perverting the Nation*, he had added these other, *καὶ καταλύοντα τὸν νόμον καὶ τὰς προφητίας*, *And destroying the law and the prophets*. In the same Passage after these words *καταδόντα φόβον δίδόναι*, *Forbidding to give tribute*, he had also added these other words, *καὶ ἀποστρέφοντα τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τέκνα*, *and perverting the women and the children*.

In the same Chapter, Vers. 43. he did not read *σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ Παραδείσῳ*, *To day shalt thou be with me in paradise*.

Lastly Marcion had taken away from his Copy the twenty fifth Verse of the twenty fourth Chapter, and these words of the twenty sixth Verse, *ὅχι ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν*. *Ought he not to have suffered?* And instead of these words, in vers. 25. *ἐφ' οἷς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφῆται*, *That the prophets have spoken*, he had put *ἐφ' οἷς ἐλάλησα ὑμῖν*, *That I have spoken to you*.

Thus we have seen what was the Gospel of Marcion, who was not far from the Apostolical Times, when the Verity of the Gospels might

might have been more easily justified from the Copies that the Apostles had left to the Churches which were founded by them. S. *Justin Martyr* had written a Book to convince this Heretick, who ^{*Justin. a-*} was then living at that time when he wrote against him. S. *Epiphanius* who hath transmitted to us this Gospel of *Marcion*, confutes ^{*pud Eu- / seb. Hist. / Ecclef. l. 4. / c. 11.*} him by his own Copy, which was not so much altered, but that there remained some Passages that were sufficient to overthrow his Novelties. S. *Irenæus*, who hath also disputed against the Opinions of this Arch-Heretick, had observed this long before. (t) It may be proved (saith this Father) by the rest of the Gospel that *Marcion* hath left, that he hath blasphemed against the only God that exists.

Altho some Diversities of *Marcion's* Copy might be attributed to the Transcribers, especially in those Passages that are of no moment; nevertheless it ought to be done with a great deal of Precaution, because it is certain, that this Heretick hath not followed in his Alterations any ancient Copies: he hath taken care only to adjust the Gospel of S. *Luke* to the prejudices of his Sect, as appears by what hath been above related. Therefore *Tertullian*, after he had objected to him all that S. *Luke* hath specified in the two first Chapters of his Gospel touching the Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ, and many other Circumstances that clearly shew that he had a real Body, adds (u) that *Marcion* had retrenched all this from his Gospel on purpose, lest it should be proved from thence that Jesus Christ had flesh as well as we.

Besides these Amendments that *Marcion* had inserted into the Gospel of S. *Luke*, there have been also some Catholicks who have altered it in some places; who would not have that read in the Gospels which did not suit with their prejudices. Therefore they have expunged the Passage wherein it is said, Chap. xix. 41. That Jesus Christ wept over the City of *Jerusalem*, because this Lamentation seemed to them to be a weakness unworthy of our Saviour. S. *Epiphanius*, who quotes these Words, observes (x) that they were found in the Copies that had not been * corrected, and by this he informs us that the *Grecians* have sometimes taken the liberty to correct their Copies, and to take away from them that which

* For so the Greek word is in this Passage of *Epiphanius* ought to be translated.

(t) *Marcion autem id quod est secundum Lucam circumcidens ex his quæ adhuc servantur penes eum, blasphemus in solum existentem Deum ostenditur.* Irenæus adv. Hæc. lib. 3. c. 11.

(u) *Hic opinor consiliis tot originalia instrumenta Christi delere ausus est, ne caro ejus probaretur.* Tertull. lib. de carne Chr. c. 2.

(x) Καὶ ἐκλαυσί, καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ καὶ Λυκᾷ εὐαγγελίῳ ἐν τοῖς ἀποκριταῖς ἀντιγράφοις. *Epiph. in Ancor. n. 31.*

did

did not please them. (y) *The Orthodox* (saith this Father) have retrenched these words, being moved thereto by fear, and not considering the end nor the force of them. But they are found at this day in the Copies of all the Christians of what Nation soever; and S. Epiphanius shews that they certainly belong to S. Luke, by (z) the testimony of S. Irenæus, who made use of them against some Hereticks.

If we may give credit to the Testimony of S. Hilary, (a) the forty third and forty fourth Verses of the twenty second Chapter were not read in many Greek, and even Latin Copies of S. Luke's Gospel. Mention is made in this place of the Angel that came to comfort Jesus Christ, and of the bloody Sweat that fell from his Body. This S. Jerom seems also to confirm. But it is easie to judge, that the Grecians had taken the liberty to rase these two Verses out of their Copies, for the same reason as they had taken away the Passage wherein it is said, that our Saviour wept. This Alteration afterwards crept into the Latin Copies. (b) *These words* (saith *Janfenius*) seem to have been retrenched by some that were afraid to attribute to Jesus Christ such notable marks of human infirmity. There are no Copies at this day, nor for a long time since, either in Greek or Latin in which this Imperfection is to be found. The Syrians and the other People of the Levant do all read these two Verses in their Copies. This Defect then must take its rise from some superstitious persons, who thought that Jesus Christ could never be obnoxious to so great a Weakness. There is no probability that these two Histories should have been added to the Text of S. Luke. (c) It is much more credible (saith *Maldonat*) that they had been blotted out of it.

Hieron.
lib. 2. adv.
Pelag.

(y) Ὁρθόδοξοι ὅ ἀφείλοντο τὸ ῥητὸν, φοβηθέντες καὶ μὴ νοήσαντες αὐτὸ τὸ τέλος καὶ τὸ ἰσχυρότατον. Epiph. ibid.

(z) Καὶ κίχηνται τῇ μωροειᾷ ὁ ἄνθρωπος. Ἐπειτα αὖ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶ ἀείρουσιν, &c. Iren. apud Epiph. ibid.

(a) Nec sanè ignorandum nobis est, quod in Græcis et in Latinis codicibus plurimis vel de adveniente Angelo, vel de sudore sanguineo nihil scriptum reperiri. Hilar. lib. 10. de Trin.

(b) Hæc crasa videntur à quibusdam, qui verebantur Christo tribuere tam insignia humanæ infirmitatis argumenta. Janfen. Gand. Concord. Evang. c. 137.

(c) Potius credendum est à nonnullis id fuisse deletum, quàm à quoquam adjunctum. Mald. Comm. in Matth. c. 26.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Gospel of S. John; and of Hereticks that have rejected this Gospel. Their Reasons with an Answer to them. An Inquiry concerning the twelve Verses of this Gospel which are not found in some ancient Copies. Several Greek Manuscript Copies are cited to clear this Difficulty. Some Criticks have imagined without any grounds that the last Chapter of this Gospel did not belong to S. John.

WE cannot precisely determine in what time S. John published his Gospel. It is only known that he hath written it the last of all. Neither have we any very certain Acts that might inform us of the Motives that induced this holy Apostle to undertake this Work after he had seen the Gospels of S. Matthew, S. Mark and S. Luke. *Clemens Alexandrinus* reports what was generally believed in his time, viz. that John having read these three Gospels, and having approved them as true, (found (a) that there was yet wanting the History of those things that had been done by Jesus Christ at the beginning of his Preaching. This was the reason (according to the Judgment of this Learned Father) that caused him to write his Gospel, especially being intreated to do it. And by this he supplied that which seemed to be deficient in the History of the other Evangelists. He did not think it necessary (b) to repeat what S. Matthew and S. Luke had already written; and this is the principal cause that obliged him to say nothing concerning the Genealogy of our Saviour. He judged it more requisite to promulge that which appertained to his Divinity. (c) John who is the last of the Evan-

(a) Μέντω δ' ἄρα λείπεσθαι τῇ γεγραπῇ τῶν πραγμάτων ἃ ἐν ἀρχαῖς καὶ κατὰ ἀρχαίαν τὴν κηρύγματον ἔσθ' ὅτε Χρὶς πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην διήγησεν. Clem. Alex. apud Euseb. lib. 3. c. 24.

(b) Ἐκότε δ' ἐν τῶν μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς τῶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν γενεαλογίαν, ἃτε Ματθαῖος καὶ Λουκᾶς περιγεγράφεισαν ἀποσιναῖσαι τὸν Ἰωάννην. Clem. ibid.

(c) Τὸν μὲντοι Ἰωάννην ἔρατον συνιδόντα ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδιλωται, περιεγράψεντα ἑαὸν ὅτι γνωρίμων, πνεύματι διορορηθέντα, πνευματικὸν ποιῆσαι εὐαγγέλιον. Clem. Alex. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. c. 14.

gelists (saith the same *Clement*) having observed that those things that related to the Incarnation of Jesus Christ had been made manifest in the three other Gospels, being inspired by God, and at the request of his Friends, composed a spiritual Gospel. *S. Epiphanius* saith also, (d) that it would have been to no purpose for *S. John* to insist any farther on that which belonged to Jesus Christ according to the Flesh, because that had been already done. Therefore he applied himself to the declaring of those Acts of which the other Evangelists had made no mention.

S. Irenaeus only saith, (e) that *S. John* set forth his Gospel at *Ephesus*, where he abode, without taking any notice of the time when, or of the Reasons that induced him to it. The Author of the *Synopsis* of the Holy Scriptures, will have it that this Apostle (f) preached it when he was banished in the Isle of *Patmos*, and that he afterwards published it at *Ephesus*. *S. Jerom* discourseth more particularly than the other Fathers of the Considerations that engaged *S. John* to write his Gospel. He affirmeth (g) that *S. John* being in *Asia*, where the Heresie of *Cerintus* and *Ebion* obtained, who denied that Jesus Christ had been really in the Flesh, was forced to write concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, at the solicitation of almost all the Bishops of *Asia*, and of many Churches that desired him to do it. He adds moreover, that it was related in the Ecclesiastical History, that this Apostle seeing himself so vehemently urged by his Brethren, granted that which they demanded, upon condition that a day should be set apart for a publick Fast on this occasion: And that the Fast being ended, *S. John*, who was filled with the Holy Ghost, began his Gospel with these words which came from Heaven, *In the beginning was the word*, &c. Whereas this History

(d) 'Οὐκ ὡς αὐτῷ χρεία ἦν τῆς ἐνσάρκου πραγματείας ἀπολογεῖν' ἦδ' οὐ γὰρ ἐσθλίσαι. Epiph. Hær. 51. n. 12.

(e) *Joannes discipulus Domini* --- Et ipse edidit Evangelium Ephefi *Asiae* commorans. Iren. adv. Hær. lib. 3. cap. 1.

(f) Τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγέλιον ἀναγερθεὶς τε καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ ἀγίου Ἰωάννου τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ ἡρακλεῖν ἐν τῷ Ἰεροσολέμοις ἐν Πάτμῳ τῇ νήσῳ, καὶ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἔχοντι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. Athan. in Synopf. Script. S.

(g) *Joannes cum esset in Asia*, Et jam tunc hereticorum semina pulkurent *Cerintus*, *Ebionis* Et cæterorum qui negant Christum in carne venisse, quos Et ipse in Epistola sua Antichristos vocat, Et Apostolus Paulus frequenter percutit, coactus est ab omnibus penè tunc *Asiae* Episcopis Et multarum Ecclesiarum legationibus de Divinitate Salvatoris alius scribere -- unde Et Ecclesiastica narrat historia cum à fratribus cogeretur ut scriberet, ita facturum se respondisse si indicto jejunio in commune omnes Deum deprecarentur. Quo expleto, revelatione saturatus illud proæmium è cælo veniens erulavit, In principio erat Verbum, &c. Hier. procem. Comm. in Matth.

might pass in the Opinion of some for Apocryphal, and for one of those Fictions that are ordinarily made use of by the *Jews* when they would give authority to a Work of great value. *Baronius* hath judiciously observed, that *S. Jerom* hath not grounded this Relation on Apocryphal Books, *Non ex apocrypho aliquo*, but on an ancient and true History that had been already explained more at large by other Writers, *Sed ex antiquâ verâque historid, ab aliis jam fufius explicatâ.*

*Baron.
ann Cb.
99. n. 4.*

There are found on the contrary since the first Ages of Christianity, certain Hereticks who maintained an Opinion altogether opposite to that of *S. Jerom*; for being very far from believing with him, that *S. John* wrote his Gospel to confute the Errors of *Cerintus*, they ascribed it to *Cerintus* himself, avouching that he was the Author thereof. *S. Epiphanius*, who knew not the Name of these Hereticks, hath given them that of *ἄλογοι*, *Alogians*, because they denied the Word called in Greek *Logos* (b) *Because they do not receive* (saith this Father) *the Word that hath been preached by S. John, they shall be called Alogians.*

These *Alogians* rejected the Gospel of *S. John*, as also his Epistles and Revelation, pretending (i) that all these Works had been invented in *Asia* by *Cerintus*, who lived at the same time with him; and they accounted them even unworthy to be read in the Church. To the end that it might not be imagined that they called in question the Authority of *S. John*, whom they believed to be an Apostle as well as the Catholicks, they endeavoured to support their Novelties with some Reasons. They said amongst other things that (k) these Books attributed to *S. John* did not agree with the Writings of the other Apostles; and that consequently they ought not to be acknowledged as Divine. Whether tends (saith they) the beginning of this Gospel: *In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God.* And these other words; *And the word was made flesh and dwelt among us* (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) *full of grace and truth.* To what purpose (added these Hereticks) is that which immediately follows, *John bare witness of him, and cried saying, This was he of whom I spake.* And a little after; *Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world.* The *Alogians*

(h) Ἐπεὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἔδιδοντο τὸν ὄντο Ἰωάννη κεκηρυγμένον, ἄλογοι καλεῖσθαι. Epiph. Har. 51. n. 3.

(i) Λόγου μὴ εἶναι αὐτῷ Ἰωάννη, ἀλλὰ κτείνου, καὶ ἐν αἵματι αὐτῶν φασιν εἶναι ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ. Epiph. ibid.

(k) Ὅτι ἡ συμφωνία τὰ αὐτὰ βιβλία τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις. Epiph. ibid. n. 4.

produced several other Passages of S. *John*, no part of which was found in the other Evangelists.

S. *Epiphanius* answers them very prudently, that if they had no other Reasons to object against the Verity of S. *John's* Gospel, they might also reject the Gospels of S. *Matthew*, S. *Mark* and S. *Luke*, who have all used the same manner of Writing, and who have every one something that is singular. He said (1) that their Method depended not on them, but that it came from the Holy Ghost as well as their Doctrine. This he explains more particularly, and at large. This Father confutes them also by the Doctrine of S. *John*, which he affirms to be altogether opposite to that of *Cerintus*. This Heretick believed that Jesus Christ was born a mere Man. S. *John* on the contrary testifyeth in his Gospel, that the Word was from all eternity, that he came down from Heaven, and that he was made Man. It is certain that *Cerintus* believed with some other Hereticks of those primitive times that Jesus was * a mere Man. Which Opinion they grounded on the Genealogy that is in the beginning of S. *Matthew*. Therefore one would think, that if *Cerintus* had designed to forge a New Gospel to authorise his Heresie, he would not have omitted this Genealogy.

* Ψιλόν
ἄνθρωπον.

It may be observed nevertheless that this Heretick acknowledged in Jesus Christ somewhat more than mere Man. This *Epiphanius* himself explains after this manner. (m) He pretends that the World was not created by the first and supreme Power; but that Jesus who was begotten of the Seed of *Joseph* and *Mary* being become great, had received from above of the Supreme God the Christ in himself, that is to say, the Holy Ghost, in the form of a Dove when he was baptised in the River *Jordan*. He attributed to this celestial Virtue that Jesus (as he thought) had received in his Baptism, all the Miracles that he wrought afterwards. He said moreover, that this Virtue left him at the time of his Passion, and that it returned to Heaven from whence it came. Perhaps the *Alogians* took occasion from hence to ascribe the Gospel of S. *John* to *Cerintus*, because this Heretick distinguished two things in Jesus Christ; for besides that they thought that he was born of *Joseph* and *Mary* after the same manner as other Men, they acknowledged in him a

(1) 'Ου γὰρ ὡς αὐτοὶ τὸ δόγμα, ἀλλ' ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἢ διδασκαλία καὶ ἀκοή. Epiph. ibid

(m) 'Ου γὰρ ἐκάρυψεν ἐκ ἀπὸ τῆς πατρὸς καὶ ἀνωθεν δυνάμεως καὶ κόσμον γένηται, ἀνωθεν δ' ἐκ τῆς ἀγαθῆς μετὰ τὸ ἀδραμῆναι τὸ Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας γυναικὸς κατελευθέναι καὶ χριστὸν εἰς αὐτὸν, τότε τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐν αὐτῷ περικεκαταμένον. Epiph. Her. 28. n. 1.

Celestial Vertue that had been communicated to him by the Sovereign God of the Universe: he called this Vertue *Christ*, distinguishing *Christ* from *Jesus*.

S. *Irenæus* hath also observed, (n) that the *Gnosticks*, the Followers of *Valentin*, altogether made use of the Gospel of S. *John* to establish their Opinions, (o) They gave to *Jesus* (saith *Theodoret*) the Name of Saviour and of *Christ* the Word. The *Sethians*, who were a branch of the *Gnosticks*, maintained also, that *Jesus* differed from *Christ*; (p) that *Jesus* was born of the Virgin, but that the *Christ* descended on him from Heaven. That which might farther confirm the *Alogians* in their erroneous Conceits was this, that there were some very learned Men, and those too very Orthodox, who had affirmed that the Apocalypse was made by *Cerintbus*, who insolently boasted that he was the true Apostle of *Jesus Christ*.

Besides these *Alogians* who refused to receive with the whole Catholick Church the Writings of S. *John* as Divine and Canonical, there was one *Theodotus* of *Byzantium*, the Chief of a Sect that were called *Theodotians*, who after their example rejected the Gospel and Revelation of S. *John*, as not belonging to him. Nevertheless, *Celsus Porphyrius* and the Emperor *Julian*, who opposed the Gospels with all their Might, have not denied that they were certainly composed by them whose Names they bore; they have been content only to decry them, as if they had been filled with Falsities and Contradictions. When *Julian* speaks of the Gospel of S. *John*, he doth not disown it to be his, but he accuseth this Apostle of having introduced Innovations into the Christian Religion: he saith, that neither (q) *Matthew*, nor *Mark*, nor *Luke*, nor even *Paul*, durst make *Jesus Christ* to pass for a God; that S. *John* was the first that hath published it, after he had observed that a great party of simple People, as well among the *Grecians* as *Latins*, was of this Opinion: thus this Emperor, who was persuaded that S. *John*'s Gospel could not be charged with falsity, gives out his imaginary Reasons that were grounded on no Authority.

(n) Hi qui à Valentino sunt eo quod est secundum Joannem plenissime utentes ad ostensionem conjugationum suarum. Iren. adv. Hær. lib. 3. c. 11.

(o) Ἰησοῦν σωτῆρα θεοπαρονομήσαν, καὶ Χριστὸν λόγον. Theod. Hæret. Fabul. lib. 2. Hær. 7. de Valent.

(p) Τὸν μὲν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου γεννηθῆναι, καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐγενῆσθαι εἰς αὐτὸν μεταλαμβάνον. Theod. ibid. lib. 2. Hær. 14. de Sethian.

(q) Τὸν γὰρ Ἰησοῦν ὅτι Παῦλος ἐτόλμασιν εἰπεῖν Θεὸν, ὅτι Ματθαῖος, ὅτι Λουκᾶς, ὅτι Μάρκος· ἀλλ' ὁ χριστὸς Ἰωάννης αἰδομένης ἡδὴ πολυπληθῆς ἑαλωκός ἐν πολλαῖς ὡς Ἑλλήνων καὶ Ἰταλιωτῶν πόλεων ὑπὸ ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ. Cyrill. Alex. lib. 10. contra Julian.

As we have above remarked, that the twelve last Verses of *S. Mark* were not read in some *Greek* Manuscript Copies, so there are also twelve that are not found in divers *Greek* Manuscript Copies of the Gospel of *S. John*, nor in some Versions of the Oriental Church. These Verses begin at the end of Chap. vii. v. 53. and end at the 11 verse of the following Chapter, insomuch that they comprehend the whole History of the Woman taken in Adultery. *S. Jerom's* manner of Expression in speaking of this Relation, makes it appear that it was not read in his time in some *Greek* and *Latin* Copies.

Hieron.

l. 2. adv.

Pelag.

Sixt. Sen.

l. 7. Bibl. S.

In Evangelio secundum Joannem, (saith this Father) *in multis & Græcis & Latinis codicibus invenitur de adulterâ muliere quæ accusata est apud Dominum. Sixtus Senensis*, who hath observed that the Anabaptists made use of the Authority of *S. Jerom* and the Testimony of some other ancient Writers, to shew that the History of the adulterous Woman had been added to the Gospel of *S. John*, hath not sufficiently answered their Objections.

Maldonat, who had thereupon consulted the ancient Interpreters of the New Testament, and many Manuscript Copies, is much more exact: he freely confesseth, (r) that of a considerable number of *Greek* Copies which he had read, he found it but in one. (s) It was not (saith he) in the most ancient Copy of the *Vatican*, which I have often cited; nor in the *Catena* or Collection of *Greek* Fathers, that contains twenty three Authors: and yet there is not one of them that makes mention of this History; even those that are printed, viz. *Origen*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Chrysostom*, *Nonnus* and *Theophylact*, do say nothing to it, though *Chrysostom* and *Theophylact* have written Commentaries on the whole Gospel of *S. John*. Lastly, *Maldonat* adds, that of all the *Greek* Authors that have written on *S. John*, *Euthymius* alone, who is a Writer of these later times, hath expounded in his Annotations this History of the adulterous Woman, and he hath done it after such a manner, as rather seems to derogate from, than to establish the Authority thereof: for he informs us at the same time, that it was not read in the most correct Copies; and that even in those where it was found, it was marked with an Asterisk, to shew that it hath been added to the Text of *S. John*.

(r) *Consulvi veteres Græcorum codices multos: nullus ex manuscriptis habebat præter unum. Maldon. Comm. in c. 8. Joann.*

(s) *Non habebat antiquissimus ille Vaticanus codex quem sæpè nominavimus, non Græca Catena, in quâ, cum tres & viginti auctores sint, nemo ejus meminit. Habemus Græcos impressos multos, Origenem, Clementem Alexandrinum, Chrysostomum, Nonnum, Theophylactum. Nemo eorum legit, cum Chrysostomus & Theophylactus scripserint in totum Joannem Commentarios. Mald. ibid.*

However, this learned Jesuit, notwithstanding these Reasons and some others which he adds in this same place, insists, that all this Criticism ought not to be preferred before the Authority of the Council of *Trent*, which hath acknowledged as Divine and Canonical all the parts of the Holy Scriptures, as they are at present read in the Church: he concludes from thence, that it hath also approved of the History of the adulterous Woman as Canonical, because it is a part of S. *John's* Gospel; and that it might not be thought that he absolutely relies on the sole Authority of the Church, he produceth several Acts, *viz.* the very Words of S. *Jerom* above related.

This Father saith, that this Revelation was found in his time in many Copies as well Greek as Latin; *In multis & Græcis & Latinis codicibus invenitur*: Moreover, *Ammonius*, who is much more ancient than S. *Jerom*, hath made mention thereof in his Harmony of the Gospels; and St. *Athanasius* in his *Synopsis* of the Holy Scriptures.

As for the Authority of S. *Chrysostom*, who hath taken no notice of it in his Homilies on S. *John*, he answers, That since this History is plain and easie to be understood, he hath not judged it necessary to expound it; besides, this Father hath spoken of the adulterous Woman in another Homily on S. *John*; and there is no probability (adds he) that what he saith in that place hath been afterwards inserted into his Text, as some have thought. He adjoineth to all these Proofs the Testimony of S. *Ambrose*, S. *Augustin*, and many other Fathers, who have all read this History, and have explained it in their Commentaries; from whence he concludes at last, that it hath been no less written by S. *John* than the rest of his Gospel: he conjectures that it hath been taken away by some *Grecian*, who hath exercised his critical Talent on this place with too much liberty.

I have a little enlarged on these Reflections of *Maldonat*, because they clear all the Difficulties that relate to the History of the adulterous Woman, which is not found in a great number of ancient Copies: but since this Jesuit speaks only in general of the Manuscript Books which he quotes, and doth not produce in particular what is contained in them, I shall endeavour to supply this defect, by the search that I have made into these Manuscripts with as much exactness as possibly I could.

I shall begin with the Commentary of *Euthymius*, of which I have only seen the *Latin* Version, the *Greek* Copy of this Author being very scarce. See his own words in his Remark on the last Verse
of

of the vii. Chap. of S. *John*, (t) *We must know that that which is read here to these words*, Then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, I am the Light of the World, *either is not found in the exact Copies, or is marked with an Obelus*. Therefore it seems to have been written afterwards, and added; *and this is a proof, that S. Chrysostom hath made no mention thereof*. This Observation of *Euthymius* is justified by the Greek Manuscript Copies, some of which do not contain this History; or if they do, it is marked with an Obelus or little stroke, or some such like note, to shew that it doth not belong to the Text of the Gospel.

Cod. MS.
Bibl. Reg.
n. 2861.

The most ancient Manuscript Copy of the Gospels, of those that are in the King's Library, hath not the twelve Verses that are now in question; but a blank space is left in the place wherein they should have been written, to signify that they were in some Copies. It is probable that the Transcriber that hath written this Manuscript had not these Verses in his Copy, because they were not read in his Church. It hath been a custom in this sort of Manuscripts to annex to the end of the Gospel of S. *John* these same Verses, with some little critical Remark; but since there are some Leaves wanting at the end of this, I can say nothing to it, only that this is found in the greatest part of other Manuscripts of this nature, as we may judge by the Manuscript that follows this.

There is in the same Library another Manuscript of the Gospels, to which is adjoined a Collection of Commentators, which is commonly called *Catena*, or a Chain. There are found in this, these twelve Verses written at the end of the Gospel of S. *John*, with this note, (u) *The Verses marked with an [Obelus] are not in some Copies, nor in the Apollinarian; but they are all in the ancient*.

I have seen in the Library of the Fathers of the Oratory at *Paris*, a like Collection or Chain of Greek Commentators on the Gospel of S. *John*, gathered together by *Nicetas*: The History of the adulterous Woman is not joyned to the Text of this Chain, but only to the end, with this remark, (x) *The end of the Gospel of S. John; and*

(t) Χρὶς ὃ μωσκειν ὅτι τὰ ἐντὸς αὐτῶν ἄχει τὸ, πάλιν ἔν ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων, ἐγὼ εἰμὶ τὸ φῶς τῶ κόσμου. ὅτι τοῖς ἀκριβοῦς ἀντισημαίους ἢ ἔχ' ἔνρηται, ἢ ὁβελισμαῖ διδ φαίνον) παρασημαί αὐτῶν καὶ παραδῆκη καὶ τέττα τὸ τεκμήριον τὸ μὴδὲ τ' Χρυσόστομον μνημονεύσαι αὐτῶν. *Euthym. Comm. in Joann. ex cod. MS. Biblioth. Reg. n. 2401.*

(u) Τὰ ὁβελισμαίνα ἐν ποιν ἀντισημαίους ἢ κέντω, ὅδε Ἀπολλινάριον ἐν τῷ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ὅλα κέντω. *MS. Bibl. Reg. n. 1883.*

(x) Τέλος τῶ χρί Ἰωάννου εὐαγγελίου ἐνθεν ὃ καὶ ἔπειτα ἐν ἀρχαίοις ἀντισημαίους, ἀπὸς Σικερίδου γεγραμὸς πρὸς τὰ τέλει τῶ αὐτῶ εὐαγγελίου, αὐτῶ καὶ εἰς τὰς καὶ ἀπὸ τὸν ἐκείνου εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῶ, &c. *Cod. MS. Bibl. PP. Orat. Paris.*

after-

afterwards, *But there are found some other things in the ancient Copies, which we think convenient to write at the end of this same Gospel, viz. And every man went unto his own house, &c.* to the end of the eleventh Verse of the eighth Chapter of this Gospel. This same note is found at the end of another like Manuscript Collection of Greek Fathers on the four Gospels, which is in the King's Library: and the same thing is read therein at the end of S. *John* (y) as in the Copy of the Oratory, and expressed after the same manner. This confirms that which *Maldonat* hath above observed in speaking of these Greek Chains, in which the History of the adulterous Woman was not found.

Furthermore, it may be seen by the Remarks that are at the end of the Manuscript Copies above produced, that some *Grecians* have thought that there was no reason why this History should not be read in the Text of S. *John's* Gospel since it was extant in the ancient Copies: I believe that on this account it hath been added in the Margin of another Copy in the King's Library, wherein it is not written; nevertheless, the Addition is of a later and different hand from the Text: This Copy is written very curiously, and the musical Notes that are marked on certain Words for the more easie singing of the Gospels, make it appear that it hath been made for the use of some Greek Church. It is very probable also, that these Verses were not read in S. *Chrysostom's* Church, since he doth not expound them in his Homily on the Section of S. *John* where we read them at present. I have not read them in another Copy in the King's Library indorsed 1860, nor in one of those that are in Mr. *Colbert's* Library, which is very rich in all sorts of Manuscripts. There is in this last another Manuscript, wherein all this History of the adulterous Woman is indeed written with the same hand as the whole Text of S. *John*; but this mark †, in form of an Asterisk was put at the beginning of every line, as if it were designed to denote that it was taken from other Copies, and that it had been inserted into the Text.

But after all, it is certain that the Greek Manuscripts in which this History is written, very much exceed those in number in which it is not to be found; and among these first there are some very ancient; for it is read in the Copy of *Cambridge*, which is the most ancient of any that we have at this day: we can say nothing of the *Alexandrian* Copy, which is imperfect in this place: it is also found

Ex Cod.
MS. Bibl.
Reg.
n. 2368.

Ex Cod.
MS. Bibl.
Reg.
n. 2860.
Ex Cod.
MS. Bibl.
Colb.
n. 4112.

(y) Τέλος τοῦ καὶ Ἰωάννου εὐαγγελίου· εὐρηται καὶ ἔπειτα ἐν ἀρχαίοις ἀντιστοιχείαις, ὡς καὶ συνεισδιδόντες γινώσκουσιν πῶς πάλιν τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐαγγελίου· ὃ ἐστὶν ταῦτα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων·

MS. Bibl. Reg. n. 1869.

Cod. MS. in a very ancient Manuscript written in Capital Letters, which is
Bibl. Colb. in Mr. Colbert's Library, and was brought from Cyprus.
n. 5149.

It is worth the observing, that there are some Manuscripts where-
in these Verses are not only read after the same manner as the
rest of the Text, but the κεφάλαιον or Chapter that answers to this
History is marked in the Margin: thus in one of the Manuscripts
of the King's Library, we read in this place at the bottom of the
Page these Words, *κεφάλαιον τῆς μοιχαλίδος*, of the adulterous Woman; and
Cod. MS. in the beginning of the Gospel of S. John, wherein are put (accord-
Bibl. Reg. ing to the usual manner of Greek Manuscripts) all the κεφάλαια,
n. 2863. Chapters or Contents of this Gospel, that of *κεφάλαιον τῆς μοιχαλίδος*, the
adulterous Woman, is found with the other Chapters. But out of a
very great number of Manuscripts that I have consulted thereupon,
in which the κεφάλαια, Contents, are set at the Head of every Gos-
pel, I could find but two, that are in the King's Library, in which
there was a particular κεφάλαιον or Summary for this History.

Nevertheless, it is certain that it hath been read, at least for some
Ages, in all the Greek Churches, because it is contained in their
Cod. MS. Lectionaries of the Gospels: I have read it in a Manuscript Copy
Bibl. Reg. of this Lectionary, but it is not ancient: we may observe, that there
n. 1884. are at the end of them some Gospels for certain Festivals, which
seem to be as it were without the Work: they might be added ac-
cording as the Ecclesiastical Office of the Grecians hath been aug-
mented; and this is common to all these Offices. See the Title,
(z) *Gospels for divers Commemorations of Saints*. These Gospels are
not for the Festivals of Saints in particular, but only in general;
as for example (a) for the Angels, for the Prophets, for an Apo-
stle, for the chief Priests, for the Martyrs, and for many others;
there are some also for the habit of a Monk, and of a Nun, for
the infirm, for Earthquakes, &c. Lastly, there are two for those
that confess, one of which is for Men, and the other that is for
Women is taken out of the eighth Chapter of S. John, and is ex-
pressed in these terms, (b) *In that time the Scribes and Pharisees
brought unto Jesus a Woman taken in Adultery*, and the rest to those
Words, *go, and sin no more*. There is in the King's Library a very
ancient Lectionary of the Gospels; but since it is not entire, and

(z) Ἐναγγέλια εἰς διαφόρους μῆμας ἁγίων. Lection. Evang.

(a) Εἰς τοὺς δαυμάτους· εἰς τοὺς πνευματικούς· εἰς ἀποστόλων· εἰς ἀποστόλους· εἰς ἱερε-
χας· εἰς μάρτυρας· εἰς ἁγίαν μαρτυρίαν· εἰς γῆμα μοναχῶν· εἰς γῆμα μοναχῶν· εἰς ἀδελ-
φούς· εἰς ἀδελφούς· εἰς σεσημένους, &c. Lection. Evangel. ex cod. MS. Bibl. Reg.
n. 1884.

(b) Ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἤγαγον πρὸς Ἰησοῦ οἱ Γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι γυναῖκα,
&c. usque ad μνηστὴν ἀμαρτάν. Lection. Evang.

the

the latter part of it being wanting, I can say nothing of the Antiquity of this Gospel that is recited to Women when they confess, and is intituled, *Ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊστικῷ καὶ ὁμοῦς γυναικῶν*.

The Proof that *Maldonat* alledgeth, taken out of the Harmony of *Ammonius Alexandrinus*, wherein this History of the Adulteress is found, is more positive and concluding, because this Writer lived in the first Ages of the Church: I shall only observe by the way, that in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, the Work of *Tatian* hath been printed under the Name of *Ammonius*, and that of *Ammonius* under the Name of *Tatian*, who hath also inserted this History into his Epitome of the four Gospels. There are nevertheless some Reasons that may cause us to question whether this Work were *Tatian's* or not: now whereas he hath written before *Ammonius*, a better testimony of the Antiquity of this History cannot be given than that which is taken from his Collection: but because there are some Arguments that seem to prove that he composed it as well from the *Hebrew* as from the four *Greek* Gospels, there will be always matter of doubt whether he hath not followed in this the *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick* Gospel of *S. Matthew* wherein it was contained; insomuch that it cannot be certainly demonstrated what was the Gospel of *S. John* from the time of *Tatian* the Disciple of *S. Justin Martyr*.

Selden, nevertheless, who hath been cited by *Walaus* on this place of *S. John*, insists very much upon these two ancient Writers, to shew that this History was ever since the Primitive Ages, in the Copies of the Eastern Church: this he confirms by the Canons that *Eusebius* hath added to the Harmony of *Ammonius*: and he concludes from thence, that *Eusebius* also read it in his Copy of the New Testament, because it is marked in these Canons: but it doth not appear that *Selden* hath very carefully examined the Canons of *Eusebius*; for there is no number or mark of a Section that answers in particular to the History of the adulterous Woman: the twelve Verses of which it is composed, are contained in the preceding *π. 86*. Section, as may be seen in these Sections or Numbers that are printed in the *Greek* New Testament of *Robert Stephen*, and in some other Editions: the *Greek* Manuscript Copies do agree in this Point with the printed: and that which clearly proves that there is no number or Section of the Canons of *Eusebius* that refers in particular to the aforesaid twelve Verses, is, that this same number *π. 86*. is also marked in the Manuscript Copies wherein they are not found: therefore it cannot be inferred from the distribution or order of the Canons, that *Eusebius* hath read the History of the Adulteress in that Book to which he hath annexed them; however, it is not to

Seld. apud
Wal. Com.
in Joan.

be denied that *Selden* and *Walaus* have had reason (c) to accuse the *Grecians* in general of assuming to themselves too much liberty in correcting their Copies, adding to, or diminishing from them sometimes according to their own humour; and perhaps they have exercised this critical Faculty too liberally on this place of *S. John* as well as on many others.

This same History of the adulterous Woman is not found neither in the *Syriack* Version that *Widmanstadius* hath published from good Manuscript Copies, of which there hath been since several other Editions; nevertheless it is in some *Syriack* Copies, from whence it hath been taken, and inserted into the Polyglott Bible of *England*; it is read also in the *Arabick* Translations that have been printed at *Rome* and in *Holland*: from whence we may conclude, that it is read at present as well in all the Eastern as in the Western Churches.

However, *Beza*, after he hath affirmed, (d) that of seventeen ancient Manuscripts which he had read, this History was wanting but in one of them, doth not forbear to suspect it, because the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers (as he saith) have either unanimously rejected it, or have been silent therein: he saith moreover, that it is not probable that Jesus Christ should have remained alone in the Temple with a Woman; that this Relation doth not cohere with what follows; and that that which is said of Jesus Christ, that he wrote with his finger on the ground, is a very extraordinary thing, and difficult to be explained. Lastly, the great diversity of Readings that is found in the *Greek* Copies in that place, causeth him to doubt of the Verity of this History.

Calv.
Com. sur
S. Jean.
c. 8. v. 1.

Calvin discourseth with a great deal more moderation, and seems also to be more reasonable than his Disciple, in his Commentary on this Passage; It is well known (saith he) that the ancient *Grecians* knew nothing of this present History; and therefore some have conjectured that it hath been taken from some other place, and added here: but forasmuch as it hath been always received in the Latin Churches, and is found in many Copies and ancient Books of the *Grecians*, and con-

(c) *Mirum non est in seculis primitivis exemplaria fuisse hodieque manere, quibus hæc aliæve periclytæ sacræ deessent, cum scilicet audacium nimis exscriptorum complurium mos tum esset aliter atque aliter pro multiplici judiciorum discrimine Evangelia variatim emendare, augere, minuire. Quod monet Hieronymus, &c.* Seld. apud Wal. Comm. in Joann.

(d) *Ex vetustis nostris codicibus 17. unus dumtaxat illam non habebat. In reliquis scripta quidem est, sed ita ut mira sit lectionis varietas.* Bez. Annot. in Joan. c. 7. v. 53.

tains.

tains nothing that is unworthy of an Apostolical Spirit, there is no cause why we should refuse to make a good use of it.

Besides that which we have just now observed concerning the History of the Woman taken in Adultery, which is not found in many Greek Copies, some Criticks have also believed, that the last Chapter of the Gospel of S. *John* was not written by this Evangelist. Indeed it seems as if he designed to finish his History with these words, Chap. 20. 30. *And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his Disciples, which are not written in this Book, &c.* Grotius, who is of this Opinion, (e) affirms, that the rest of this Gospel hath been added after the Death of S. *John* by the Church of *Ephesus*, after the same manner as the last Chapter of the *Pentateuch*, and the last Chapter of the History of *Joshua* have been annexed to these Books of the *Sanhedrim* of the *Jews*; but he alledgeth no solid proof of what he so freely avoucheth: something indeed might have been added to the History of *Moses* and *Joshua* after their decease, because (as I have elsewhere observed) they whose Office it was amongst the *Hebrews* to write the Annals of this Republick, have continued their Histories; and therefore these two Chapters cannot be properly called Additions, but rather a Continuation of the Chronicle of this Commonwealth. This case is not the same as that of the Gospel of S. *John*, for the Church of *Ephesus* was not charged to continue it. It may be said, that the last Chapter of this Gospel hath not been put in its proper place, and that there hath happened some change with respect to the order and sequence of the Words; but if we reflect on the Style of S. *John*, and the little regard to a Method or Coherence that appears throughout his whole Book, we shall rather impute to himself these small Defects which alter not the Verity of this History.

(e) *Sicut caput ultimum Pentateuchi & caput ultimum Josue post Mosi & Josue mortem additum est à Synedrio Hebræorum: ita & caput quod sequitur post mortem Joannis additum ab Ecclesiâ Ephesinâ.* Grot. Annot. ad. cap. 20. Joan. vers. 30.

CHAP. XIV.

Of the Acts of the Apostles that have been received in the Church. Other Acts of the Apostles that have been forged.

ALthough there have been several different Acts that bear the Name of the Apostles, yet the Church hath received none as true but those that we now read at this day under this Title, and which all Antiquity attributes to S. Luke: this is the reason that in some Manuscript Greek Copies we find the name of this Evangelist at the beginning of this Work; he declares himself in his Preface, that he is the Author of it, presenting it to his Friend *Theophilus*, to whom he had already dedicated his Gospel.

S. Jerom affirmeth, (a) that this History was written at Rome, and that it extends to the fourth Year of Nero, which was (according to his Opinion) the second of S. Paul's abode in that great City. The Author of the *Synopsis* of the Holy Scriptures, thought (b) that the Acts of the Apostles had been preached by S. Peter, and that S. Luke had afterwards committed them to Writing; but S. Luke hath recorded almost nothing else but matters of fact of which he himself had been a witness. And this is the difference that S. Jerom makes between the Gospel of this Disciple of the Apostles, and the Acts, in regard that not having seen Jesus Christ, he could not write his Gospel, but on that which he had learned from others, *sicut audierat scripsit*; whereas having followed S. Paul in the most part of his Travels, he was an eye-witness of his Actions, and therefore he hath published nothing but what he had seen himself, *sicut viderat ipse composuit*.

Although the Title indeed of this History bears the name of all the Apostles in general, nevertheless it informs us of very few things concerning them, only conducting them to the time when they dispersed themselves into divers Provinces to preach the Gospel. S. Luke comes after this to S. Paul's Travels, who was accompanied with S. Barnabas, without describing the Itineraries of the other

(a) Cujus historia usque ad biennium Romæ commorantis Pauli pervenit, id est usque ad quartum Neronis annum. Ex quo intelligimus in eadem urbe librum esse compositum. Hieron. de Script. Eccl. in Lucā.

(b) Τας παλαιας ὅτις ἀποστόλων ἀκηρόδοσι μὲν Πέτρος ὁ ἀπόστολος, ὡς καὶ ἐκείνου ὁ αὐτὸς ἀνέγραψε. Athan. in Synopf.

Apostles; neither doth he finish even those of *S. Paul*. If it be demanded why *S. Luke* hath not perfected his History, and why he hath not left us in Writing the rest of those Actions of which he was a Witness? I have no other Answer to make, but that which *S. John Chrysostom* hath already made to those that in his time asked the same Question. This learned Bishop saith, That what *S. Luke* hath written in this matter is sufficient for those that will apply themselves to it; that the Apostles moreover, and their Disciples, who preached the Gospel of Jesus Christ, (c) have always insisted on that which was most necessary; that they did not study to write Histories, because they have left many things to the Churches by Tradition only. And this ought to be considered; for it is certain that the principal business and care of the Apostles was to preach the Gospel, and that they would have written nothing of their Preachings, if they had not been earnestly solicited by the People whom they had instructed. The Christian Religion might be preserved without any Writings, by Tradition alone.

S. Chrysostom complains in the same place, that that little we have of the History of the Apostles was so neglected in his time, that many were not only ignorant of the Author, but they did not know whether it had been written. It seems that the Gospels and the Epistles of *S. Paul* were then only accounted to belong to the New Testament; perhaps none but these two Works were read in the Churches in these Primitive Ages. We see also, that the Books that are consecrated for the use of the Greek Churches, do only bear these two Titles, viz. 'Εὐαγγέλιον Gospel, and 'Απόστολος Apostle; nevertheless, afterwards this last Book hath been named Πράξεις ἀποστόλων, because it contains, besides the Epistles of *S. Paul*, the best part of the Acts of the Apostles, and even the other Books of the New Testament.

Whereas this History that comprehends the principal Actions of *S. Paul* is short, a certain Priest of *Asia*, since the Primitive times of Christianity, thought fit to add to it, in form of a Supplement, another Book, intituled, *The Travels of Paul and Thecla*. We are informed by *Tertullian*, (d) that some Women made use of these Acts, to prove by the Authority of this Holy Apostle, that it was

(c) Ὅτι οὗτοι τὰ ἐκτελεῖντα αὐτοῦ ἱκανοῦς, καὶ (ὅτι) οὐκ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἔχοντες τὸ αὐτοῦ ἢ αὐτοῦ πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα παραδόντες διδόντες. Joann. Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Act. Apolt.

(d) Quod si quæ Pauli perperam scripta legunt exemplum Theclæ ad licentiam mulierum docendi tingendique defendunt, sciunt in Asiâ presbyterum qui eam scripturam construxit quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum atque confessum, id se amore Pauli fecisse, loco decessisse. Tertull. lib. de Bapt. c. 17.

lawful for them to preach in the Churches and to baptize. This Father answers those that alledged the Testimony of *S. Paul* taken from these Acts, that the Priest of *Asia*, the Author of them, had been convicted that he had forged them, and that he himself had avouched that he was induced to compose them by the love that he had for this Apostle. He solidly confutes them, by making it appear, that these Acts contained a Doctrine altogether contrary to that of *S. Paul*. (e) What probability is there (saith he) that *S. Paul* should grant to Women a power to teach and to baptize, who hath not so much as permitted them to learn in the Church, forbidding them absolutely to speak therein?

Hieron.
descript.
Eccles. in
Luca.

Gelas.
Decr. 1.
part. dist.
15. c. 3.

Baron. an.
c. 47. n. 3,
4. & 5.
Epiph.
Hier. 78.
n. 16.

S. Jerom, who hath made mention of these Acts published under the Title of the *Travels of Paul and Thecla*, adds, that it was *S. John* that caused the Priest that composed them to be convicted of Forgery: *Tertullian* nevertheless, whom he cites in this Passage, doth not speak of *S. John*; he saith only, that this Priest was of *Asia*. Pope *Gelasius* hath put this Book in the number of Apocryphal Works. *Baronius* distinguisheth these false Acts of *Thecla* from others that give an account of the Life and Martyrdom of this Saint: he supports the Authority of these last by the Testimony of several Fathers who have quoted them; and among others, by that of *S. Epiphanius*, who, relying on the credit of these Acts, relates that *Thecla* having espoused a very rich and noble man, broke off her Marriage after she had heard *S. Paul*: This Cardinal adds, that *Fausus*, a famous *Manichean*, hath produced this same History of *Thecla*, and that he hath taken occasion from thence to condemn the Doctrine of *S. Paul* as abominable, because he had compelled by his Discourses a married Woman to continue in perpetual Continency. *S. Augustin* (adds *Baronius* farther) who rehearseth these Words of *Fausus*, and exactly answers his Objections, doth not reject as Apocryphal these last Acts that are intituled the *Martyrdom of Thecla*.

But it is probable, that these last Acts have been taken from the former; and it is no wonder that the Fathers have made use of an Apocryphal Book, that was composed by an Impostor, because there were many true things in these *Travels of Paul and Thecla*. However it be, I think it is more convenient to reject them altogether, than to approve of one part and to condemn the other, because it would be very difficult to distinguish that which was true from the false. If we may judge by the Fragments that remain, this Work was filled with Fables; for we find therein, that *Thecla*, being the

(e) Quàm enim fidei proximum videtur, ut is docendi & tingendi daret femine potestatem, qui ne discere quidem constanter mulieri permisit. Tertull. ibid.

Companion of S. Paul in his Travels, had in some measure a share in his Apostleship: it is declared in these Acts that he preached and baptized; and S. Jerom, who without doubt had read them, makes mention of the Baptism of a Lion, which is the cause that he esteems them as false and Apocryphal Books. *Hierom. ib.* Πseudo Pauli & Thecle (saith this Father) & totam baptizati leonis fabulam inter apocryphas scripturas computamus.

Whereas the Apostles and their Disciples have left us no relations of their Travels in Writing, but that which we have concerning those of S. Paul and S. Barnabas, this gave occasion to the counterfeiting of some under their Names. Some false Acts have been published under these Titles, *The Travels of Peter, the Travels of John, the Travels of Thomas*, and many others of this sort: there was one also called in general, *The Itinerary, or Travels of the Apostles*. Thus have they endeavoured ever since the Primitive Ages of the Christian Religion, by this means to supply that which seemed to be wanting in the History of the Apostles, as if it were necessary that the Church should have all their Actions in Writing: but these Books were rejected with the common consent of all the Catholick Churches, as Supposititious and Apocryphal; insomuch, that of all the Acts of the Apostles that have been published, none have been preferred but those that were composed by S. Luke.

Nevertheless, there were some Sectaries from the very first beginning of Christianity, who being Enemies to S. Paul, absolutely condemned this History written by S. Luke his faithful Companion in his Travels. The *Ebionites*, who treated this Apostle as an Apostate, seeing that the Acts that had been received in the Church contradicted their Doctrine, (f) composed new ones, which they filled with Impieties and Calumnies against S. Paul, that no credit might be given to the History of S. Luke: they invented I know not what Fables to render this holy Apostle odious; and they gave them out as the true Reasons that had obliged him (g) to write against the Circumcision, the Sabbath, and the Old Law. (h) They made use of these new Acts of the Apostles (saith Epiphanius) to invalidate the Truth. The *Encratites* or *Severians*, (i) who acknow-

(f) Περίεις ὅ ἄλλας καλῶσιν ἀποστόλων ἔν, ἐν αἷς πολλὰ τ' ἀσυνέσια αὐτῶν ἔμπεδα. Epiph. Har. 30. n. 16.

(g) Κατὰ ὁπτιμῆς γλεσφέναι καὶ κατὰ σαββάτου καὶ νομοθεσίας. Epiph. ibid.

(h) Ἐνθὺν ἡ παράγωγι καὶ τ' ἀληθείας ἑαυτοῦ ὠπίσσω. Epiph. ibid.

(i) Σιδοινοῦλοι καὶ ἄλλοι μὴ νόμο καὶ περὶ τῆς καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῖς -- βλασφημῶντες ὅ Παῦλον τ' ἀποστόλον ἀδικοῦσιν αὐτὸ τὰς ὁπτιμαί, μηδὲ τὰς περὶ τῆς ἀποστόλων καταδολογίαι. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. cap. 29.

ledged, with the Orthodox, the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospels, loaded *S. Paul* also with bitter Invectives and Reproaches, and entirely rejected his Epistles with the Acts of the Apostles.

Lastly, the *Manicheans*, who esteemed their Patriarch *Manichee* not only as an Apostle, but as the *Paraclet* or Comforter that was promised, did not allow the Acts of the Apostles, because the descent of the Holy Ghost is therein declared. (k) If they should receive these Acts (saith *S. Augustin*) in which express mention is made of the coming of the Holy Ghost, they could not say that he had been sent to them in the Person of *Manichee*. But let us leave these Enthusiasts, who had no other reason to refuse the Books that were approved by the whole Church than this, because they did not suit with the *Idea* that they had formed of the Christian Religion: This was the cause (according to *Tertullian*) that the *Marcionites* did not regard the Acts of the Apostles. I shall say nothing here concerning the Acts of *Barnabas* that have been published under the Name of *John* surnamed *Mark*; (l) which are very displeasing to *Baronius*, and have been manifestly forged, being also contrary in some things to the true Acts of the Apostles, as this Cardinal hath observed.

Tertul.
lib. 5. adv.
Marc. c. 2.

(k) Si illos Actus Apostolorum acciperent, in quibus evidenter adventus Spiritus Sancti predicatur, non invenirent quomodo id immixtum esse dicerent. Aug. de utilit. cred. cap. 3.

(l) Quædam Barnabæ Acta ab aliquo, ut apparet, nebulae scripta circumferuntur, & ab imperitis magno applausu accipiuntur. Baron. Annal. Chap. 51. numer. 51.

CHAP. XV.

Of the Epistles of St. Paul in general. Of Marcion, and of his Copy of these Epistles. False Letters attributed to St. Paul.

THE Name of *S. Paul* that is prefixed at the head of all his Epistles, except that which is written to the *Hebrews*, doth plainly discover the Author: and since they are for the most part directed to particular Churches, who read them publickly in their Assemblies, they have been afterwards communicated to other neighbouring Churches, and at last, by the same means, to all the Faithful. I shall not here make it my business too critically to enquire into their order, nor the time when they were written, because in whatsoever manner they are placed, as to their distribution or circumstances of time, this will cause no alteration in the Text which will always remain the same: nevertheless, thus much may be observed with *S. Chrysostom*, who hath diligently examined this matter, that though the Epistle to the *Romans* stands in the first rank, yet it was not written first; there are clear proofs, that the two Epistles inscribed to the *Corinthians* were written before it: this learned Bishop believes also, that *S. Paul* had written to the *Thessalonians* before he wrote to those of *Corinth*; this may be seen more at large in the Preface before his Homilies on the Epistle to the *Romans*, wherein he gives an Example of the Prophets who have not been ranked according to the order of the time of their respective Prophecies. *Theodoret*, who hath treated on this Subject after *S. Chrysostom*, whom he often epitomizeth, alledgeth, as an instance of the same order as that of *S. Paul's* Epistles, the distribution of the Psalms of *David*. (a) As *David* (saith he) being inspired by God hath written the Psalms, and others afterwards have put them into what method they thought fit, without having regard to the time when they were composed; so in like manner, the same thing hath been done with respect to the Epistles of *S. Paul*.

Joann.
Chrys.
Præf.
Hom. in
Epist. ad
Rom.

(a) ὡς τὸν ἱερὸς δαυὶδ συνέγραψε μὲν ὁ θεὸς δαυὶδ, τὰ παλαιὰ πνευματικὰ δὲ ἄλλα, συνέγραψε ὁ θεὸς ἄλλοις πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἐνεργούντι. ὡς τὸν μὲν πνευματικὸν ἐκπύμπαν ἐνοείας, τὸν δὲ τὸν χρόνον ὃν τὰς ἐκτέλει. ὡς τὸν καὶ τὰς ἀποστολικὰς ταύτας ἐπιστολὰς συγκελεύσας ὅτιν ἐνέειν. Theodor. Præf. in Epist. Paul.

Marc. a-
pud E-
piph. He-
ret. 42.

Marcion, who received the greatest part of the Epistles of *S. Paul*, from which nevertheless he had retrenched some Passages, had placed them after this manner: The Epistle to the *Galatians* was the first of all, and afterwards the two to the *Corinthians*; the Epistle to the *Romans* was the fourth; afterwards followed the two to the *Thessalonians*, and after these the Epistles to the *Ephesians*, *Colossians*, to *Philemon*, and to the *Philippians*. He acknowledged none but these ten Epistles in the aforesaid order; for as to the Epistle directed to those of *Laodicea*, some Portions of which he received (according to *Epiphanius*) it is the same as that which is written to the *Ephesians*, as it is easie to prove from the Passages that this Heretick hath cited, and are also related by *S. Epiphanius*.

Marcion had intituled his Collection of the Epistles of *S. Paul*, Ἀποστολικὸν, *Apostolick*. The *Marcionite* that is introduced in the Dialogue against those of this Sect, attributed to *Origen*, did often refuse to acknowledge some Quotations out of *S. Paul's* Epistles, and saith in speaking to *Adamantius*, who objected to him some words of this Apostle (b) *I do not believe your false Apostolick*. And in another place he answers *Adamantius*, who asked him whether he believed the Apostle, that is to say, *S. Paul*, τὸ ἐμὲ ἀποστολικῶ πείθεσθαι, *I believe my own Apostolick*. Therefore *Adamantius* doth not oppose to him the Epistles of *S. Paul* after the same manner as they were read in the Church, but that which the *Marcionites* called their *Apostolick*, which was a Collection that they had made of these Epistles. *I have* (saith *Adamantius*) *your Apostolick*: ἔχω τὸν ἀποστολικὸν σε. This caused *S. Jerom* to say, speaking of this Collection of the *Marcionites*, (c) that they had forged Epistles of the Apostles of their own invention, and that he admired how those people durst take upon them the name of Christians.

S. Epiphanius hath observed some Passages that *Marcion* had altered in the Epistles of *S. Paul*, which I shall here produce according to their order. In chap. 5. v. 31. of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, where we read these words; *A man shall leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife*, this Heretick had taken away τῇ γυναικὶ, *to his wife*.

In the Epistle to the *Galatians*, chap. 5. verse 9. instead of the word ζυγῶν, *leaveneth*, he had put δολοῖ, *corrupteth*, which doth not interrupt the sense in this place, and therefore it seems rather to be

(b) Τὸ σὺ φασὶν ἐ πείθεσθαι ἀποστολικῶ. Orig. Dial. adv. Marc. sect. 1.

(c) Cum Apostolorum Epistolas non Apostolorum Christi fecerunt esse, sed proprias, miror quomodo sibi Christianorum nomen audeant vindicare. Hieron. proœm. in Epist. ad Tit.

a various reading, than an alteration made on purpose. Indeed in the ancient Copy of *Clermont* that is kept in the King's Library it is read *ἁλλοῖ*, and in the *Latin* Version that is annexed to it, which is the ancient vulgar, there is according to this reading *corruptit*, as in the vulgar used at this day.

In the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, chap. 9. vers. 8. where we read *ἢ οὐ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα λέγει*, Or saith not the law the same also? He had in his Copy *εἰ καὶ ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως ταῦτα ἐ λέγει*, Tho the law of Moses doth not say the same.

Chap. 14. ver. 19. of this same Epistle *Marcion* had altered the sense of these words, *Yet in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding*. He read in his Copy, instead of *τῷ νοί μου*, In my understanding, *διὰ τὸν νόμον*, because of the law. But it is probable, that this reading of *Marcion* came from a fault of the Transcriber, who hath read *διὰ τὸν νόμον* instead of *διὰ τῷ νοί μου*, as it is in the present *Greek* Copies, which reading approacheth nearer to that of *Marcion*, than that of *S. Epiphanius*, which agrees nevertheless with the two most ancient *Greek* Copies that we have, viz. the *Alexandrian*, and that of *Clermont* in the King's Library. It is read in these two Copies *τῷ νοί μου*, and in the ancient *Latin* Version which is joined to the Copy of *Clermont* there is *sensu meo*. It is also read *τῷ νοί μου* in the ancient Copy of the Epistles of *S. Paul*, which is in the Library of the *Benedictin* Fathers of the Abbey of *S. Germain*; but there is in the *Latin* Version that is added to it *per sensum meum*. This causeth me to believe that the Author of this ancient Translation hath read in his *Greek* Copy *διὰ τῷ νοί μου*, as it is read at present. Nevertheless *S. Epiphanius* accuseth *Marcion* of making this alteration on purpose, to wrest the words of *S. Paul* to his own Conceptions.

In the second Epistle to the *Corinthians*, chap. iv. 13. where we read, *Having the same spirit of faith according as it is written*, *Marcion* had retrenched from his Copy these words, *καὶ τὸ γὰρ ἐμυμήθη*, According as it is written. *S. Epiphanius* reproves him in this place. Because (saith he) whether he reads these words or not, the scope of the Discourse is plainly evident. Indeed it might happen that he did not read them in his Copy. And if this Heretick had made no other alterations in *S. Paul's* Epistles than those that we have above marked, there would be no cause to charge him with corrupting them; for there are found in our *Greek* Copies greater diversities than those, and very many more in number.

Neither do I see that *Marcion* hath committed a great fault in placing the Epistle to the *Romans* the fourth in his Copy. Nevertheless

theless, if we believe *Epiphanius*, this Heretick (*d*) hath only set it in this order, because he would have nothing right. But *S. Paul* himself hath not ranked his Epistles after the same manner as we have done at present; as this Father always supposeth in his Dispute against *Marcion*. He confesseth himself that the *Greek* Copies do not all agree in this point. For when he accuseth him of having placed the Epistle to *Philemon* the ninth, which *S. Paul* (according to his opinion) had set the last, he saith that in some Copies it was found immediately before that which was written to the *Hebrews*, and which was the fourteenth in these Copies. He adds (*e*) that there are others wherein the Epistle to the *Hebrews* is the tenth, immediately before the two that are written to *Timothy*, and those that are directed to *Titus* and *Philemon*.

S. Epiphanius declares in the same place, (*f*) that he hath remarked nothing in the Epistle to *Philemon*, because *Marcion* had entirely corrupted it. *Tertullian* (*g*) on the contrary affirms that this Epistle hath not been vitiated by *Marcion*, because it was too short. He admires only (*h*) that this Heretick having received a Letter directed to a single person, would not acknowledge the two that are written to *Timothy*, and that to *Titus*, which treat of Ecclesiastical Affairs. I believe (saith he) that he hath affected to diminish the number of these Epistles. *S. Jerom* speaks also of this Epistle to *Philemon* after the same manner as *Tertullian*, (*i*) and he proves also by the authority of *Marcion*, that it is one of *S. Paul's* Epistles, since this Heretick who hath rejected a part of them, and hath altered those which he approved, hath received this entire, and hath not so much as touched it because it was too short.

If we may give credit to *Epiphanius*, *Marcion* had inserted into his Book which he had intituled *Ἀποστολικόν*. *Apostolick*, an Epistle of

(d) "Οὕτως γὰρ ἔτι παρὰ Μαρκίωνι κεῖσθαι, ἵνα μὴδὲν ὀρθὸν παρ' αὐτῷ εἴη. Epiph. Her. 42.

(e) "Ἀλλὰ ὃ ἀντίγραφον ἔχει τὸ πρὸς Ἑβραῖους ἀρδύτως πρὸς τὸν δὲ οὐ πρὸς Τιμόθεον καὶ Τίτον καὶ Φιλήμονα. Epiph. ibid.

(f) "Ἀπὸ πάντων τὸ πρὸς Φιλήμονα ἔσθαι περιττότατον διὰ τὸ ὀλιγογράφε αὐτῷ διατεθῆναι παρ' αὐτῷ κεῖσθαι. Epiph. ibid.

(g) Soli huic Epistole brevisitas sua profuit, ut falsarias manus Marcionis evaderet. Tertull. lib. 5. adv. Marc. c. 21.

(h) Miror tamen, cum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quid ad Timotheum duas, & unam ad Titum de Ecclesiastico statu compositas, recusaverit. Affecit etiam numerum Epistolarum interpolare. Tertull. ibid.

(i) Pauli esse Epistolam ad Philemonem saltem Marcione auctore doceantur, qui cum ceteras Epistolas ejusdem, vel non suscepit, vel quaedam in his mutaverit atque corroserit, in hanc solam manus non est ausus mittere, quia sua illam brevisitas defendebat. Hieron. procem. Comm. in Epist. ad Philem.

S. Paul to the *Laodiceans*. But he confesseth at the same time that that which this Heretick cites out of the Epistle to those of *Laodicea*, is found in that which is inscribed to the *Ephesians*; therefore it ought not to be put in *Marcion's* Collection under the name of *Laodiceans*, but under that of *Ephesians*; otherwise he would have received eleven Epistles of S. Paul, whereas he never acknowledged but ten. *Tertullian* indeed rebukes him (k) for changing the Title of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*; nevertheless he judiciously observeth, that this alteration of the Title is of no importance, because S. Paul writing to a particular Church, wrote at the same time to all the others. *Nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes Apostolus scripserit, dum ad quosdam.*

He accuseth him with more reason of taking away from his Copy of this Epistle to the *Ephesians*, chap. 2. v. 20. the word *Prophets*; for where we read it as the Church doth, *And are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*, *Marcion* read only, *Are built upon the foundation of the Apostles*. It seems also that *Tertullian* hath reproved *Marcion* for taking away these words from the same Epistle, chap. 6. v. 2. *Which is the first commandment with promise. Nam etsi Marcion, (saith he) abstulit, Hoc est enim primum in promissione preceptum; Lex loquitur, Honora patrem & matrem. S. Jerom* moreover (l) hath charged *Marcion* with expunging out of his Copy of the Epistle to the *Galatians*, chap. 1. v. 1. these words, *And God the Father*, to make it appear that Jesus Christ was himself the Author of his Resurrection, and not his Father.

Besides these various Readings of the *Apostolick* of the *Marcionites* above remarked, the *Marcionite* in the Dialogue attributed to *Origen*, saith that it was not read in this *Apostolick*, 2 Cor. xv. 38. ὁ Θεὸς δίδωσιν αὐτῷ σῶμα κατὰ τὴν ἡδύτατον, *God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him*; but ὁ Θεὸς δίδωσιν αὐτῷ πνεῦμα κατὰ τὴν ἡδύτατον, *God giveth it a spirit as it hath pleased him*. And after those words immediately follow these in the *Apostolick*: Σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχρὸν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν· σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, ἐγείρεται ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ. *It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body; it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption.* These last words are also found in our Copies, but in another order.

Orig.
Dial. cont.
Marc.
Sect. 5.

(k) *Ecclesie quidem veritate Epistola istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodiceos; sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi & in isto diligentissimus explorator. Tertull. lib. 5. adv. Marc. c. 17.*

(l) *Sciendum quoque in Marcionis Apostolo non esse scriptum, & per Deum patrem, volentis exponere Christum non a Deo patre, sed per semetipsum suscitatum. Hieron. lib. 1. Comm. in Epist. ad Gal. c. 1. v. 1.*

Tertullian solidly confutes these Sectaries who would receive nothing of *S. Paul* but what was agreeable to their notions, in representing to them, that they might as well reject his Works all together as a part of them. He demands of *Marcion* what proofs he hath of his *Apostolick* which he ascribed to *S. Paul*, *Pauli quoque originem a Marcione desidero*. He requires him (*m*) to produce some certain marks that this Book did really belong to that Apostle, and to declare who hath given it this Title, and by what Tradition it came to his hands?

The same Objections might be made at this day to some Protestants who receive the Works of the Apostles, and refuse at the same time to submit to the true Traditions of the Church, to which they are beholden for these Apostolical Writings. For who hath told them that that which they read under the name of *S. Paul* is certainly his? Is it (saith *Tertullian*, speaking to *Marcion*) because this Apostle hath said so himself? *Ipse se Apostolum est professus*. (*n*) Every one (adds he) might give a testimony of himself; but it is not believed, at least if it be not attested by others, because no Man can be a Witness of his own Actions. This is a very strong proof against the *Marcionites*, because they not allow the Acts of the Apostles, which afford a great Testimony to the Doctrine contained in the Epistles of *S. Paul*.

The Author of the Dialogue against the *Marcionites* makes use of this same argument to convince his *Marcionite*. (*o*) We do not receive (said this *Marcionite*) neither the Prophets nor the Law, because they are not of our God, but we receive the Gospel and the Apostle. What Apostle do you mean (answers *Adamantius*) for there are many? *Paul*, saith the *Marcionite*. To whom *Adamantius* replies, How can you be assured that *Paul* hath written the Epistles that you read under his name, since there is no mention thereof made in the Gospel? And whereas these Hereticks acknowledged none but the Gospel of *S. Luke*, which they had adjusted to their Notions, and their *Apostolick*. *Adamantius* presseth them very much thereupon, and concludes against them, that according to their

(*m*) *Edas velim nobis quo Symbolo susceperis Apostolum Paulum, quis illum tituli charactere percusserit, quis transmiserit tibi, quis imposuerit ut possis eum constanter exponere. Tertull. lib. 5. adv. Marc. c. 1.*

(*n*) *Profiteri potest semetipsum quivis: verum professio ejus alterius auctoritate conficitur. Alius scribit, aliis subscribit. Alius obsignat, aliis actis refert. Nemo sibi & professor & testis est. Tertull. ibid.*

(*o*) *Ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐχόμεν ἐν δόγματι· ὅτι καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ δόγμα ἐστὶν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὸ ἀπόστολον. Apud Orig. Dial. contr. Marc. lect. 2.*

Principle no Scriptures give a Testimony to S. Paul, since he is not mentioned in the Gospel. The Marcionite is obliged to have recourse to S. Paul, who hath written of himself, *Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ*. But Adamantius opposeth to him those other words of S. Paul, *He that bears witness of himself is not approved*. He makes it appear from hence, (p) that he is not to be believed that only gives his own Testimony of himself.

S. Epiphanius moreover reproves Marcion, for having quoted a Passage out of S. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, under the Title of an Epistle written by this Apostle to the Laodiceans, which (saith he) *was never in the number of the Epistles of S. Paul*, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\grave{\epsilon}\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\alpha$. ^{Epiph. Her. 42. n. 12.} But we can only infer from thence, that Marcion was mistaken in the Title of this Epistle, reading under the name of the Laodiceans that which is written to the Ephesians. Nevertheless S. Epiphanius hath reason to say, that there never was any Epistle to the Laodiceans. The Fragment that Jacobus Faber, Sixtus Senensis and some other Authors have published under this Title, and hath been Printed even in some Bibles, is a Piece of no Authority; not but that in the Primitive Ages of the Church there hath been read an Epistle under this Title attributed to S. Paul, but the most Learned Fathers have rejected it as an Apocryphal Act. Therefore S. Jerom (q) affirms, that in his time it was generally exploded by all the world; insomuch that there is no other true Epistle to the Laodiceans, but that which is written to the Ephesians, the Title of which the Marcionites had only changed. The Hereticks (saith Tertullian, in speaking of the Marcionites) (r) have intituled to the Laodiceans that Epistle which we read directed to the Ephesians.

They that have forged an Epistle of S. Paul to the Laodiceans, have taken occasion from these words of his Epistle to the Colossians, chap. 4. vers. 16. *And when this Epistle is read amongst you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea*. S. Chrysostom hath observed on these last words, (s) that some Writers had taken notice before him, that it was not a Letter that S. Paul had sent to the Laodiceans, but one that they of Laodicea had written to S. Paul, because it is not in the Text

Chrys. Homil. 12. in Epist. ad Coloss.

(p) Οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ μάρτυρῶν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἐστίν. Ibid.

(q) Legunt quidam & ad Laodicenses, sed ab omnibus exploditur. Hieron. de Script. Eccles. in Paulo.

(r) Epistola quam nos ad Ephesios prescriptam habemus, heretici ad Laodicenses. Tertull. lib. 5. adv. Marc. c. 11.

(s) Τινὲς λέγουσιν ὅτι ἐκ τῶν Παύλου ἐστὶν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπιστολήσαντος, ἀλλὰ ἢ παρ' αὐτοῦ Παύλου ἢ ὑπὸ ἑπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι ἐκ τῆς Λαοδικείας, φησὶ, γεγραμμένη. Chrysost. Hom. 12. in Epist. ad Coloss.

to the *Laodiceans*; but from *Laodicea*. This hath caused *Theodore*, who repeats the same thing in his Commentary on the Epistle to the *Colossians*, to conclude that the Letter to the *Laodiceans* that some produced in his time was a counterfeit, *παλαστῶν ἐπιστολῶν*. *Baronius* hath had reason to prefer the Judgment of these two *Greek* Fathers before that of some *Latin* Writers, who have thought that *S. Paul* hath written fifteen Epistles one of which (as they say) hath been lost. *P. Amilote* seems to have favoured this Opinion, when he translated this Passage of the Epistle to the *Colossians*, *Ye shall likewise read that which I have written to the Laodiceans*. But if there were an ambiguous expression in his Text, he ought also to retain it in his Version, and not to limit it, by giving us an Epistle of *S. Paul* to the *Laodiceans* which never was, according to the Sentiments of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers.

I shall take no notice of two other Epistles that have been heretofore published under the Name of *S. Paul*, viz. a third to the *Corinthians*, and a third to the *Thessalonians*, because they have much less foundation than that which is supposed to have been written to the *Laodiceans*. I shall only observe, that some Impostors in his time dispersed abroad false Letters in his name, that they might thereby authorise their false Doctrines, which obliged him to write his Name at the bottom of his Epistles with a certain particular Mark, as he declares himself at the end of his second Epistle to the *Thessalonians*.

I shall not here insist on the *Ebionites*, concerning whom I have already sufficiently discoursed. Since these Hereticks had declared openly against *S. Paul*, and had also composed false Acts to defame his Person and Doctrine, they were very far from receiving his Epistles which contradicted their Opinions. The *Encratites Severians* (t) who had no less an aversion for this Holy Apostle, absolutely rejected his Epistles. *Origen* moreover makes mention of a certain Sect that took the name of *Helcesaites*, (u) who acknowledged but a part of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures as well of the Old as the New Testament. But they altogether disapproved of *S. Paul*, and (x) had forged I know not what Book, which they feigned to have fallen down from Heaven.

(t) Βλασημῶντες ὃ Παῦλον ἡ ἀπίστολον ἀδυνάσιν αὐτῇ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. c. 29.

(u) Ἀπεθεῖ πνῶ ἀπὸ πάσης γραφῆς, κέρχεται ῥητοῖς πάλιν ἀπὸ πάσης παλαιᾶς καὶ καινῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων τέλει ἀπεθεῖ. Orig. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 38.

(x) Βίβλον πνῶ φέρεσιν ὡς λέγουσιν ὅτι ἔρρετο καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Orig. ibid.

It is no wonder that so many ancient Hereticks have publicly exploded the Writings of *S. Paul*; because they pretended that not having seen Jesus Christ in the flesh, he could not call himself his Apostle. They accused him moreover of having taught things that were contrary to the Law of God. In a word, they esteemed him as an Innovator, who under pretence (said they) of introducing Christianity among the Gentiles had abolished the Sabbath, the Circumcision, and the other Ceremonies of the Old Law. Therefore this Holy Apostle speaks often in his Epistles concerning his Apostleship, which his Enemies opposed in vain. Tho he had not seen *Jesus Christ*, yet he invincibly proveth that he hath not brought any Novelties into the Gospel, since he hath avouched nothing before he had thereupon conferred with the other Apostles. This hath caused *Tertullian* to say, that *S. Paul* (y) went on purpose to *Jerusalem*, to deliberate with the Apostles on all things that appertained to the preaching of the Gospel, that he might do nothing that was opposite to their Doctrine. He adds that after this Apostle had had a Conference with them, and that they had all agreed on a certain and sure Rule of Faith, they separated to go every one to his respective station to promulge the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

S. Augustin relies on the same Principle in disproving a false Epistle that the *Manicheans* had published under the Name of Jesus Christ. Is there any one so foolish, (saith this Learned Father) as to believe that the Epistle that *Manichee* attributes to Jesus Christ is true, and that the Gospel of *S. Matthew* which hath been always preserved in the Church, doth not belong to this Apostle? He demands whether they could with any color of Reason believe an obscure Man, who appeared not in the World till more than two hundred years after Jesus Christ, (z) since the Church would not have given credit to *S. Paul* himself, who was called to the Apostleship immediately after the Ascension of our Saviour, if he had not conferred with the Apostles touching the Doctrine that he preached.

It is a Maxim generally received among all the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, that Jesus Christ alone is the Author of the Christian

(y) Propterea Hierosolymam ascendit ad cognoscendos Apostolos & consultandos, ne forte in vacuum cucurrisset, id est, ne non secundum illos evangelizaret. Denique ut cum auctoribus contulit & convenit de regulâ fidei, dexterâ miscuere, & exinde officia prædicandi distinxerunt. Tertull. lib. 4. adv. Marc. c. 2.

(z) Cum ipse Apostolus Paulus post ascensionem Domini de caelo vocatus, si non inveniret in carne Apostolos, quibus communicando & cum quibus conferendo Evangelium ejusdem esse societatis appareret, Ecclesia illi omnino non crederet. Aug. lib. 28. cont. Manich. c. 4.

Religion, and that his Apostles who have been the Witnesses of his Actions and Words, have only related to us those things that they had seen or learned from their Master. When it was objected to the primitive Fathers, that the Gospels of S. *Mark* and S. *Luke*, as also the Epistles of S. *Paul* ought not to be received as Canonical, because the Authors of these Writings were not Apostles, but only Apostolical Men. They have answered that these Apostolical Persons have written nothing but what they had received from their Masters. They have concluded from thence, that the same authority ought to be given to their Writings, as if the Apostles themselves had been the Authors of them. Therefore when *Tertullian* speaks of S. *Luke* and S. *Mark*, who (according to his Opinion) were only Apostolical, he adds at the same time, that these Apostolical Men were not (a) alone, having written jointly with the Apostles, and after them; and that therefore their Doctrine could not be suspected, since it hath been authorised by their Masters, and even by Jesus Christ who had constituted these Masters. We may apply unto S. *Paul* that which *Tertullian* saith here of S. *Mark* and S. *Luke*. And this may serve to resolve all the Objections of the ancient Hereticks who refused to allow his Writings, because they denied that he was truly an Apostle.

I have already given an account of the *Manicheans*, who acknowledged nothing of S. *Paul*, but what was agreeable to the Idea that they had formed of the Christian Religion. These Sectaries argued against common Sense. For in as much as they were not able to reconcile two Passages of this Apostle, they thought it sufficient to conclude from thence that one of the two must of necessity be corrupted; since it was not possible (said they) that he should contradict in one place what he had affirmed in another. When it was demanded of *Fauftus* whether he received the Apostle, *Apostolum accipis*? He answered that he did. And when it was proved to him by the Writings of S. *Paul*, that he ought to believe that Jesus Christ the Son of God derived his Original from *David*, according to the flesh, he then replied, (b) that it is not credible that the Apostle of God should have written things that are contrary, and overthrow

(a) Si & Apostolicos, non tamen solos, sed cum Apostolis & post Apostolos, quoniam predicatio discipulorum suspecta fieri posset de gloriae studio, si non adisset illi auctoritas magistrorum, imò Christi qui magistros Apostolos fecit. *Tertull.* lib. 4. adv. Marc. c. 2.

(b) Non equidem crediderim Apostolum Dei contraria sibi scribere potuisse, & modò hanc, modò illam de Domino nostro habuisse sententiam. Apud *Aug.* lib. 11. cont. *Fauft.* c. 1.

one another: he maintained that the Epistles of S. Paul had been interpolated as well as the Gospels; and to make his Subtilty more apparent in inventing new Answers, he adds, that this Apostle might be reconciled with himself, in saying that he had two Conceptions thereupon, and that that which was objected was his old Opinion, which he had abandoned after he had been better instructed.

But let us leave these Hereticks who had no certain Principles, and were therefore obliged sometimes to have recourse to their *Paraclet*, which was their great Engine. We see almost the same thing at present in some illuminated and enthusiastick Persons, who for want of good reasons are forced to fly to I know not what private Spirit that discovers to them the most hidden Mysteries of the Christian Religion. I would entreat these People to reflect a little on the Conduct of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers in their Disputes against the Hereticks, and on their manner of arguing; they will find therein neither *Paraclet*, nor private Spirit, but solid Arguments, that are very far from the Fanaticism which is predominant in our Age.

Lastly, to return to S. Paul, the vanity of these ancient Hereticks was so great, that S. Irenæus was compelled to confute some Sectaries, (c) who affirmed that this Apostle only was endued with the knowledge of the Truth, and that he alone had the Revelation of the Mysteries of the Gospel: but this Father convinceth them by the very Words of S. Paul, who hath born witness to the Apostleship of S. Peter.

(c) *Eos autem qui dicunt, solum Paulum veritatem cognovisse, cui per revelationem manifestum est mysterium, ipse Paulus convincat eos dicens unum & ipsum Deum operatum Petro in Apostolatu circumcisionis, & sibi in Gentibus.* Iren. adv. Hær. lib. 3. c. 13.

CHAP. XVI.

Of the Epistle to the Hebrews in particular. Whether it be St. Paul's, and Canonical. What Antiquity hath believed thereupon, as well in the Eastern as in the Western Countries. The Opinions of these later Ages concerning this Epistle.

SINCE I have no other design in this Work than to treat of the Text of the New Testament, and to establish as much as is possible the Writings of the Apostles, I shall not insist in particular on the Subject of every Epistle of S. Paul; this is a task that belongs rather to a Commentator of the Scriptures, than to a Critical History of the Text: for this reason I come immediately to the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, that seems to have been disputed in Antiquity, principally in the Western Churches, some of which have refused to read it in their publick Assemblies: there are also at this day some learned Criticks, that doubt whether S. Paul be the Author thereof, though they acknowledge it as Divine and Canonical. Wherefore it is convenient to examine the Acts that we have relating to this matter.

If we follow this Rule of *Tertullian* that is grounded on good reason, *That that is true which is most ancient, Illud verum quod prius*, there will be no occasion to enquire whether the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was certainly written by S. Paul; for all the Eastern Churches seem not to have doubted thereof: the *Arians* have been the first amongst them that have obstinately rejected it, seeing that it was not favourable to their Innovations: this caused *Theodores*, speaking of these Hereticks, to say, (a) that they ought at least to have respect to the length of time, and to consider that this Epistle had been read in the Churches ever since they had received the Writings of the Apostles. (b) He opposeth to them moreover, the

(a) Ἐδει ὃ αὐτοῦ, εἰ καὶ μὴδὲν ἔπειτα τὸ χρόνον γὰρ αἰδεσθῆναι τὸ μᾶλλον ἐν ᾧ τὴν ὁποῖον ἐπιστολὴν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἀναγιγνώσκοντες διατίλεται ἢ ἐκκλησίας ὅμοιοι· ὅτι καὶ ἡ ἀποστολικὴν γραμμὰν αἱ τὰ Θεοῦ μετέλαρον ἐκκλησίαι, καὶ ἐκείνη καὶ τὸ ὅτι ἐξ ἐκείνης ἐπιστολῆς τὴν ὁρίσασθαι κατέπυν. Theod. Praef. Comm. in Epist. ad Hebr.

(b) Εἰ καὶ μὴδὲ τὸτο ἰκανὸν πείσει αὐτοῦ, εὐσεβίῳ γὰρ ἐχέτω συνιδεῖναι τῆς Παλαιστίνης, ὅν ἡ δὲ οἰκίαν δόξιας ἀποκαλῶσι σωτήρεσιν· καὶ ὅτι τὸ θεοτάτη Παύλου τὴν ὁποῖον ἐπιστολὴν ἀπολόγησιν ἡ καὶ τοῦ παλαιῆς ἀπαιτίας ταύτῃ αὐτῆς ἐφιστὴν ἐρχόμενα. Theod. ibid.

Testimony of *Eusebius Caesariensis*, who could not be suspected by them, because they esteemed him as their Chief. Now this *Eusebius* hath acknowledged, that the Epistle directed to the *Hebrews* was *S. Paul's*, and that all the Ancients had believed it so to be.

As for the Testimony of the Ancients, this cannot be true but of those of the Eastern Church; for *Eusebius* himself hath observed, that some in the Western Church did not receive this Epistle: but the Authority of these Western Writers ought not to be regarded, since *S. Clement* Bishop of *Rome*, who lived before them, hath cited it in the Letter that he wrote in the name of his Church to those of *Corinth*, as the same *Eusebius* assures us. He proves by the Authority of this Disciple of the Apostles, that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* hath been reckoned with good reason in the number of the Apostolical Writings, and doth not in the least doubt of the Authors, because the most part of the ancient Doctors of the Church, especially in the East, have believed that it did truly belong to *S. Paul*: but since they supposed that he wrote it in *Hebrew*, they do not agree as to the Interpreter: (c) some (saith *Eusebius*) affirm, that it hath been translated by *S. Luke*, and others by *S. Clement*. He confirms this last Opinion by the Style of this Epistle, which is very like to that of *S. Clement*; nevertheless, *Clement Alexandrinus* proves on the con-

Cl. Alex.
in Hypot.
apud Euf.
Hist. Eccl.
l. 6. c. 14.

trary, by this resemblance of Style, that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* which he avoucheth to be *St. Paul's*, hath been interpreted by *St. Luke*.
Origen, who hath written Homilies on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, was of opinion, (d) that the matter indeed was *S. Paul's*, but that the Expressions were too lofty and too elegant to be his, who wrote in a very simple and plain Style. This learned Critick doth not attribute this diversity of Style to the Translator, but to the *Amanuensis* that committed the Doctrine of *S. Paul* to Writing. (e) I believe (saith *Origen*) that the Sense and Conceptions are of this Apostle, but that the Phrase and Composition is another's who hath collected the Sayings of his Master, and set them down in writing: nevertheless, what he adds in the same place makes it appear, that in his time there were some Churches that did not ascribe this Epistle to

(c) Οἱ δὲ τὸ εὐαγγελιστὴν Ἀνδρῶν οἱ δὲ Κλήμεντα τῶτον αὐτὸν ἑρμηνεύσαι λέγουσι πῶς γεγραμμένον ὁ καὶ μάλιστα ἀν' ἀληθείας Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 38.

(d) Ὁ χαρακτήρ τῆς λέξεως καὶ τοῦ ἔργου ἑστραμμένος ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁμοῖοις καὶ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικῶν τῶ ἀποστόλου ὁμοιογραφῶντα αὐτὸν ἰδιωτικῶν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, τὴν τὴν φράσιν. Orig. Homil. in Epist. ad Hebr. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 6. cap. 25.

(e) Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποταμιεύω τὴν εἰρημὴν ἀν' ἧς τὰ μὲν νοήματα τῶ ἀποστόλου εἰσὶν ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ συντάξις ἀπομνημονεύσας τῶν ἀποστολικῶν, καὶ ἀσπείρει χαλκιστῶν τῶν τῶν ἐρημῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. Orig. ibid.

the *Hebrews* to *S. Paul*; and he judgeth also, that it cannot be certainly determined who hath written it: (f) *If any Churches* (saith he) *reads this Epistle as S. Paul's, they are to be commended in this, for it is not without reason that the Ancients have thought that it was his, but God alone knows the truth thereof.*

*Melchif.
ap. Epiph.
Hær. 55.*

*Cath. ap.
Epiph.
Hær. 59.*

*Hierac.
ap. Epiph.
Hær. 67.*

The Greek Fathers who have lived before and after *Origen*, and even the greatest part of the Hereticks, have quoted it under no other name than that of this Holy Apostle. The *Melchisedecians*, who preferred *Melchisedec* before *Jesus Christ*, grounded their Opinion on the Epistle of *S. Paul* to the *Hebrews*. The *Catharians*, who were a branch of the *Novatians*, relied also on these Words of this Epistle, Chap. vi. v. 4, 5, 6. *For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly Gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good Word of God, and the powers of the World to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto Repentance, &c.* *Hieracs* an Egyptian, who was the Chief of the Sect of the *Hieracites*, which was embraced by divers Monks of *Egypt*, pretended to prove by this same Epistle to the *Hebrews*, that *Melchisedec* was the Holy Ghost. Lastly, many other Hereticks who separated themselves from the Church, attributed it to no other but *S. Paul*; which induceth me to believe, that this Opinion was founded on an ancient Tradition of the Churches.

Cajus in the mean time, a famous Writer who lived at the beginning of the third Century under Pope *Zephyrinus*, in a Dispute that he had at *Rome* with the *Cataphryges*, and which was published, acknowledgeth only thirteen Epistles of *S. Paul*, not mentioning that which is directed to the *Hebrews*. *Eusebius*, who hath taken notice of this Dispute, observes, (g) that some *Romans* in his time had not as yet received the Epistle to the *Hebrews* as *S. Paul's*: and in another place where he speaks of the Epistles of the Apostles, after he had said that the fourteen Epistles of *S. Paul* were known to all the World, he adds, (h) that some have rejected this which is written to the *Hebrews*, under pretence that the *Roman Church* did not believe it to belong to *S. Paul*.

Baronius hath not done justice to this Historian, when he accu-

(f) Εἴ τις ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὐτὴν διδοκίμειτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ· ὃ γὰρ εἰκὴ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδωκασί· τίς δ' ὁ γὰρ ἴσας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, τὸ μὴ ἀληθὲς θεοῦ οἶδεν. Orig. ibid.

(g) Ἐπεὶ καὶ οἱ εἰς δευτέρου ἑσθ' Ῥωμαίων ποτὶν ὃ νομίζεται τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τυχάνειν. Euseb. Hist. Ecc. l. 6. c. 20.

(h) Ὅτι γὰρ μὴ πᾶσι ἡδωθήκασι τὴν ὡς ἐστὶν Ἐβραίων, ὡς δ' Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίαν ὡς μὴ Παύλου ἔσαν αὐτὴν ἀντιλήγουσιν φησιν, ὃ δὲ αὐτὸν ἀγνοεῖν. Euseb. Hist. Ecc. lib. 3. c. 3.

seth him of favouring in these Words the Party of the *Arians*, his good Friends, and of insinuating that the Church of *Rome* had doubted of the Verity of this Epistle; for besides that *Eusebius* doth only relate a simple matter of fact that was evident, and which *S. Jerom* hath afterwards explained more at large, he openly declares in this very place in favour of those that believed that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was certainly written by *S. Paul*, when he adds, that he will give an account, in the sequel of his History, what hath been the belief of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers as to this point: and he acquits himself after such a manner, as makes it manifest, that none of these Ancients, nor even the *Roman Church*, have ever doubted before the time of *Cajus*, of the Authority of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. *Tertullian*, nevertheless, hath attributed it to *S. Barnabas*, but without shewing any Reasons.

The same *Baronius* is very much perplexed when he would explain the Sense of *S. Jerom*, who avoucheth, that although this Epistle hath been always received as *S. Paul's* in the Eastern Churches, (i) yet the *Latins* do not put it in the number of the Canonical Epistles: this he repeats in several other Passages of his Works. But whereas most part of the *Latin Fathers* before him, and even in his time, have acknowledged this Epistle not only to be Canonical, but also to be written by *S. Paul*; this Cardinal thinks that *S. Jerom* was deceived in relying altogether on the Testimony of *Cajus* and *Eusebius*, without consulting the custom of the *Latin Churches*.

I confess that this Father in his Book of Ecclesiastical Writers, according to his usual method, hath only copied the Words of *Eusebius*, when he speaks of *Cajus*; but the same thing cannot be said of the other Passages, where he affirms distinctly from *Eusebius*, that this Epistle is not generally received amongst the *Latins*. *Paulus Apostolus* (saith he in his Commentary on *Isaiab*) in *Epistola ad Hebræos*, quam *Latina consuetudo non recipit*. He adds a little after, (k) that this Epistle of *S. Paul* was rejected, because that in writing to the *Hebrews* he made use of such Testimonies of the Holy Scriptures as were not found in their Copies. This evidently proves that there were some Churches in those times in which the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was not acknowledged as Canonical; this can only be understood of the Western Churches, since he grants that it was

Hier. ib.

(i) *Eam Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter Scripturas Canonicas*. Hier. Epist. ad Dardan.

(k) *Fauli quoque idcirco ad Hebræos Epistola contradicitur, quod ad Hebræos scribens utatur testimoniis quæ in Hebræis voluminibus non habentur*. Hier. Comm. ut II. 12. c. 6.

universally approved in all those of the East. He declares moreover, in his Letter to *Dardanus*, (1) that without having regard to the Custom of his Time, he received the Epistle to the *Hebrews* and the Apocalypse as Canonical Books, though the *Latins* did not allow the first, nor the *Grecians* the second. He prefers in this place the Authority of the Ancients who had cited these two Works as Canonical, before the practice of his time. It cannot be said then, with Cardinal *Baronius*, that *S. Jerom*, when he affirms that in his time the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was not commonly received amongst the *Latins*, had only respect to the Testimony of *Cajus*, and that he hath done nothing but transcribed the Words of *Eusebius*; for he speaks plainly of the Custom of his time.

But it may be objected, that *S. Hilary*, *Optatus*, *S. Ambrose*, *S. Augustin*, and some other Fathers who lived before *S. Jerom*, or were contemporary with him, have not doubted that this Epistle was not only Canonical and Divine, but they have likewise believed that it was *S. Paul's*; how then could it come to pass that this Father should avouch that it was not acknowledged in his time amongst the *Latins*? It is true, that these Fathers who were *Latins*, and some of whom lived at the same time with *S. Jerom*, have all ascribed the Epistle directed to the *Hebrews* to *S. Paul*, which he doth also himself in divers Passages of his Works: however, I will not conclude from thence with *Baronius*, that this learned Man hath not sufficiently considered the Practice of his Church, (m) and that he hath too easily given credit to the Testimony of *Eusebius*; but I will say that a difference ought to be put between the Custom of Churches, and the Attestation of particular Writers. When *S. Jerom* hath written that in his time the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was not allowed among the *Latins*, he hath declared the Practice of many Churches of the West who did not read it in their publick Assemblies: this doth not hinder but that the Fathers of those times might esteem it as Canonical, and also as *S. Paul's*. It would be an easy matter by this means to reconcile *S. Jerom* with some other *Latin* Fathers.

(1) Quod si Epistolam ad Hebræos Latinorum consuetudo non recipit, inter Scripturas Canonicas, nec Græcorum quidem Ecclesiæ Apocalypsim Joannis eadem libertate suscipiunt, Et tamen nos utramque suscipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, qui plerumque utriusque adutuntur testimoniis, non ut interdum de apocryphis facere solent, sed quasi canonicis & ecclesiasticis. Hier. Epist. ad Dard.

(m) Hec igitur cum ex Eusebio Hieronymus exscripserit, majorem illi quam par erat fidem tribuit, dum putavit Latinos dictam Epistolam non recipere. Baron. ann. ch. 60. n. 52.

That which confirms the distinction that I have now made between the Custom of Churches and that of private Writers, is this, that we find some very ancient *Greek* Manuscripts of the Epistles of *S. Paul* with the old *Latin* Version annexed to them, in which the Epistle to the *Hebrews* hath been separated on purpose from the body of the Epistles. It seems to me that there can be no other reason given of this Separation but this, that the *Latins* who have transcribed these Copies (as I shall prove hereafter) did not read this Epistle in their Churches: furthermore, it may be observed, that all the ancient *Latin* Authors have not attributed the Epistle to the *Hebrews* to *S. Paul*; for besides that *Tertullian* doth not refer to it but under the name of *S. Barnabas*, there is no probability that it was received as Canonical in the Church of *S. Cyprian*, since he never makes use of its Authority in all his Works. If we should say with *Baronius*, that this holy Bishop hath followed *Tertullian* in this, whom he read always, and called his Master, this would not resolve the difficulty: I doubt not but if the Epistle to the *Hebrews* had been publicly read at that time in his Church, as being *S. Paul's*, he would have quoted it as well as the others.

As for the Reasons that are alledged against this Epistle, they are not of that weight as to make void the Testimonies of so great a number of Authors who have attributed it to *S. Paul*. First, The Objection proposed by *S. Jerom* in his Commentaries on *Isaiah*, that is taken from the Passages of the old Testament, which the Author of this Epistle hath not cited from the *Hebrew* Text, but from the *Greek* Version of the Seventy, is of no force at all: he should have first made it appear that it was originally written in *Hebrew*, which cannot be easily proved; and though it were true, yet might it be always said, as of the Gospel of *S. Matthew*, that the *Greek* Translator hath inserted into his Version the Passages of the Old Testament according to the Septuagint, which was read at that time by the most part of the *Jews*.

If we follow the Opinion of *Origen* who was well versed in the Criticism of the Sacred Books, this Epistle hath been composed in *Greek* by one of the Scribes or Disciples of *S. Paul*, who hath only committed to Writing that which he learned from his Master. This may serve to answer another Objection that is ordinarily offered against this Epistle, by reason of the diversity of Style, which is pretended to be very different from that of the other Epistles of *S. Paul*. *Theophylact*, who hath taken notice of this, declares (n) that

(n) Εἰ δὲ τὸν γραφεῖν σκάνδαλον πίνοντες, μαρτυροῦνται ὅτι Παῦλος ὁ Ἑβραῖος γράψῃ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὑπερέβησεν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς Ἑβραῖος ἢ λόγον ποιῶντος εἰς ἡ τὴν ἑλληνίδα μετετίθει, ὡς ὁρῶντες ὑπὸ Λυκᾶ, ὡς ἢ ἐνίοι φασιν, ὑπὸ Κλήμεντος, ἢ ἢ μάλιστα οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ γραφή. Theoph. Comm. in c. 1. Epist. ad Hebr.

S. Paul hath written it in *Hebrew*, and that it was afterwards translated into *Greek* by S. Luke, as some think, or by S. Clement, which he judgeth most probable, because of the resemblance of the Stile:

Theodor.
Pref.
Com. in
Epist. ad
Hebr.

It is objected in the third place, that if this Epistle were S. Paul's, he would have set his Name at the head of it, as he hath done in his other Epistles. Theodoret, who hath related this Objection from the *Arians*, answers, that there is a great deal of difference between this Letter, and the others that bear the Name of this Apostle: he hath prefixed his Name (according to his Opinion) at the beginning of those that were written to the Gentiles, because he was their Apostle; whereas in writing to the *Jews*, whose Apostle he was not, it was not requisite for him to do the like. The *Arians* might have seen this Answer in the Works of *Clement Alexandrinus* who lived before the appearing of their Heresie, as also another that he gives in the same place; but it is grounded as the former, only on a Conjecture: he saith (o) that it was a piece of Wisdom in S. Paul not to set his Name at the head of an Epistle that he wrote to a sort of People that were possessed with a prejudice against him; and that he did very prudently in concealing his Name, that he might not hinder them from reading it.

Epist. ad
Hebr. c. 6.
v. 4, 5, 6.

There is a fourth Reason that appears to be much stronger than the preceding, against the ascribing the Epistle to the *Hebrews* to S. Paul. It seems as if the Author designed absolutely to condemn all Repentance after Baptism; for he saith, Chap. 6. that it is impossible that those that have been once enlightened, that is to say, baptized, and have fallen away after this, should be renewed by Repentance; this is manifestly contrary to the Doctrine of the New Testament, and to the Practice of the Church. There is a great deal of probability, that this was that which obliged some *Latin* Churches not to read this Epistle publicly in their Assemblies, especially since the *Novatians* had made use of it to support their Schism. (p) The *Novatians* (saith Theodoret) used these Words to oppose the Truth. I have found an Answer to this Objection in an ancient *Latin* Translation that hath been made before the time of S. Jerom; for whereas in the present vulgar, the *Greek* Word ἀδύνατον is translated *impossibile*, it is in this ancient Version *difficile*;

(o) Ἐβραίοις δὲ ἀπεύχοντο ἀνελθεῖν εὐαγγελιστὴν κατὰ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὑποτίθουσιν αὐτὸν, ὡς αὐτὸς πάντοτε ἐκ ἐκ ἀρχῆς ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν τὸ ὄνομα θεοῦ. Clem. Alex. in Hypotyp.

apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 6. c. 14.

(p) Ταῦτα οἱ Νουατίου κατὰ τὴν ἀληθείαν ἐπιτίθενται τὰ ῥητά. Theod. Comm. in c. 6. Epist. ad Hebr.

and

and that which deserves further to be observed, is that it ordinarily follows the words of the *Greek Text*; but in this place it is rather according to the Sense, than the strictness of the Letter. This makes it evident that in those times the *Latins* found this expression somewhat harsh, and contrary to the Judgment of the Church; and this partly induced *Luther* to deny that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was written by *S. Paul*, or any other of the Apostles.

Erasmus hath affirmed in his Notes on this Epistle, that *S. Ambrose*, Eras.
Not. in
Epist. ad
Hebr. who hath written Commentaries on the Epistles of *S. Paul*, hath made none upon this, because it was received but very lately in the *Roman Church*. He adds, that the *Grecians* have already embraced it, because it was contrary to the *Arians*, who rejected it. But he is mistaken in attributing Commentaries to *S. Ambrose* that are not his, and which the most judicious Criticks believe to be made by *S. Hilary*, Deacon of *Rome*: neither is it true that it hath been more approved by the *Grecians*, since it was exploded by the *Arians*; for *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who lived before *Arimus*, hath avouched that it was *S. Paul's*. Besides they that have disputed against the *Arians*, have thereupon opposed to them the universal Consent of the Ecclesiastical Writers before the appearing of their Heresie.

The same *Erasmus* offended the greatest part of the Divines, especially those of the Faculty of *Paris*, by these two Propositions. (q) *It hath been always doubted of the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: and to say the truth, I do still doubt thereof.* This so exasperated the Reverend Doctors of *Paris*, that they censured the aforesaid Propositions after this manner. (r) *These two Propositions are insolent and schismatical against the Practice and Decrees of the Church in the Councils of Nice, Laodicea, the third of Carthage, in which S. Augustin assisted; and in a Council of seventy Bishops wherein Pope Gelasius presided.* These Divines added to this the Testimonies of *S. Denis*, whom they called the Disciple of *S. Paul*, of *S. Clement*, *Innocent I.* *S. Gregory Nazianzen* and of some other Fathers. From whence they conclude (s) that it is not true that it hath been al-

(q) *De Epistolæ ad Hebræos auctore semper est dubitatum; & ut ipse ingenue fatear, adhuc dubito. Erasmi. Propos.*

(r) *He due propositiones arroganter & schismaticè asseruntur, contra usum & determinationem Ecclesiæ in multis conciliis Nicæno, Laodicensi, Carthaginensi tertio, cui adfuit Augustinus, & in Concilio 70. Episcoporum præside Gelasio. Cens. Facult. Theol. Paris. tit. de Auct. lib. Novi Test.*

(s) *Nec verum est semper dubitatum esse de auctore hujus Epistolæ ad Hebræos, cum scribat Origenes quod ante tempora sua omnes antiqui & majores eam ut Pauli Apostoli suscipiebant. Cens. Facult. Theol. Paris. ibid.*

ways doubted of the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, since *Origen* avoucheth that all the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers that have lived before him, have received it as *S. Paul's*.

2 Pet. 3.
15.

Eras.
Declar.
ad Theol.
Parif.

Moreover these same Divines opposed to *Erasmus* the words of *S. Peter*, that are at the end of his second Canonical Epistle directed to the *Hebrews*, wherein he saith expressly, that his beloved Brother *Paul* had also written unto them; they do not doubt but *S. Peter* designed in this place to hint at the Epistle of *S. Paul* to the *Hebrews*. *Erasmus* in his answer to these Doctors of *Paris*, is content to say that all these Councils do not speak of the Author of this Epistle, but only of its Authority; that this Title hath been added to it to denote the Epistle, and that it is not denied that many have cited it under the name of *S. Paul*.

Guill. Est.
præf. Com.
in Epist.
ad Hebr.

Whereas this Answer is too general, and doth not fully satisfy the Authority of these Councils that attribute the Epistle to the *Hebrews* to *S. Paul*, I shall produce what *Estius* a Learned Doctor of the Faculty of *Doway* hath judiciously remarked on all these difficulties. This Divine after he hath treated of the Question concerning the Author of this Epistle, adds this other, *viz.* whether it be a point of Faith to believe that *S. Paul* is the Author, insomuch that the contrary opinion is to be accounted Heretical, as *Catharinus*, *Sixtus Senensis*, *Alfonsus* and some other modern Writers have averred, being supported by the authority of some Councils, and by the practice of the whole Church that reads it in her Offices under the name of *S. Paul*?

Estius, notwithstanding all these Authorities, doth not judge it to be a matter of Faith. This he proves by the positive words of divers Fathers, and among others of *S. Jerom* and *S. Augustin*. We have already seen what the first hath thought thereupon. And as for *S. Augustin*, he saith expressly in discoursing of this Epistle, (t) that many believe it to be *S. Paul's*, and that others deny it to be his. Now it is certain that this Father speaks in this place of Orthodox Authors. As for what concerns the Councils, the same *Estius* answers, that some of those have been holden before the time of these two Fathers, and that consequently nothing can be concluded from them.

He insists further, that nothing can be inferred from the others, (v) because the design of the Bishops that were there assembled,

(t) *Epistola quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, quamplures Apostoli Pauli esse dicunt, quidam verò negant, Sc. Aug. lib. 16. de Civ. Dei 2. 22.*

(v) *Neque enim Patribus horum Conciliorum propositum erat definire cujus ea Epistola sit auctoris, sed quod una cum cæteris Pauli Epistolis, quibus receptissimo Ecclesiæ more eam annumerant, inter Divinas Scripturas sit habenda. Est præf. Comment. in Epist. ad Hebr.*

was not to determine who hath been the Author of this Epistle, but only to put it in the number of the Canonical Scriptures with the other Letters of *S. Paul*. Then he justifies by these same Councils, and he proves it also by these words of the Council of *Cartbage*, *Pauli Epistolæ tredecim, ad Hebræos una*. This Council hath (as he thought) separately mentioned this that is directed to the *Hebrews*, because they were not so well assured, as of the others, that it was *S. Paul's*, he adds (x) that *S. Augustin*, who had a Veneration for this Council, would not have doubted of the Author of this Epistle, if he were persuaded that this had been therein defined. This Father (saith he) knew well that all things that are said or disputed in Councils are not Articles of Faith; and he proves it by some Examples. But after all, *Estius* (y) concludes with the Divines of *Paris* and *Melchior Canus*, that it would be a piece of rashness to maintain that *S. Paul* is not the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. Nevertheless he durst not pronounce the opinion of those to be Heretical, who deny that it was written by this Apostle; and in this he appears very judicious, for indeed there is no matter of Heresie in it. Furthermore I have enlarged a little on this Remark of *Estius*, because it clears every thing that hath respect to the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and teacheth the Divines at the same time not to run too fast in point of Heresie.

The Divines of *Paris* do not only condemn *Erasmus* as being too rash, but they add also in their Censure touching the Authors of every Book of the New Testament, (z) that it is no longer lawful for any Christian to doubt of them. On this account every man that is not fully satisfied that *S. Paul* wrote the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, is a bad Christian, according to the determination of the Faculty of Divinity at *Paris*; nevertheless he is not an Heretick. *Erasmus* instead of replying punctually to these Learned Doctors, eludes their Decrees by general Answers. He saith that he doth not believe (a) that every thing that is received by an Ecclesiastical Custom, becomes immediately an Article of Faith. However he shews his submission to the Decrees of the Church, when he adds in this same

(x) Verum sciebat Augustinus, non omnia quæ quoquo modo dicuntur in Conciliis definitivè dici. Est. ibid.

(y) Censeo quidem cum Theologicâ Facultate Parisiensi, cum Melchiore Cano, temerarium esse si quis Epistolam ad Hebræos negaret esse Pauli Apostoli; sed hæreticum ob id solum pronunciare non auserim. Est. ibid.

(z) Jam non est fas Christiano de illis dubitare. Cens. Fac. Theol. Paris.

(a) Quidquid receptum est usu Ecclesiastico, non protinus obligat nos ad credendum tanquam articulum fidei. Erasim. Declar. ad Theol. Paris.

place, that if he follows his Reason, (b) he cannot judge that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* is S. *Paul's*, nor S. *Luke's*; neither that the second under the name of S. *Peter*, was written by this Apostle; nor that the Revelation doth belong to the Apostle S. *John*: that all his scruple is to know, whether the Church hath so authorised the Titles of holy Writ, that she hath decreed, not only that that which is contained in these Books is most true, but also that those persons to whom they are attributed are certainly the Authors of them. If this be so (saith *Erasmus*) I condemn my Reasons of doubting; for I prefer the express Judgment of the Church, before any human Reasons whatsoever.

Upon the whole matter, all this Difficulty may be reduced to this, to know whether the Church in pronouncing the Books of the Old and New Testament to be Canonical and Divine, hath declared at the same time that they were written by the Authors whose Names they bear. This is necessary to be observed here, that it may be applied to the other Books of the New Testament, of which we shall treat in the Sequel of this Work.

Calv. argu-
m de ses
Comm. sur
l'Epist.
aux Hebr.

It hath been often objected to the *Lutherans*, that their Patriarch hath rejected this Epistle, who believed not that it was written by any Apostle. But besides their reading it in their *German* Bibles with the other Epistles of S. *Paul*, they answer that it might be permitted to their Master to raise this Doubt after so many ancient Authors: and that he hath nevertheless acknowledged (c) that it was most excellent, and composed by some Disciple of the Apostles. Calvin hath prefixed to his Commentaries on this Epistle, a Discourse where he saith, *For my part I cannot believe that S. Paul is the Author of it.*

One would think that the *Socinians* should expunge this Epistle to the *Hebrews* out of the Catalogue of the Canonical Books, in imitation of the *Arians*. In the mean time tho they are persuaded that there is no certainty as to the Author of it, yet they do not forbear to receive it with the other Epistles of S. *Paul*. Therefore So-

(b) *Juxta sensum humanum nec credo Epistolam ad Hebræos esse Pauli aut Lucæ, nec secundam Petri esse Petri, nec Apocalypsin esse Joannis Apostoli qui scripsit Evangelium—solum ille scrupulus habet animum meum, an Ecclesia receperit titulos, ut non solum velit haberi pro indubitatis quæ in huius libro scripta sunt, verum pariter exigat ut pro indubitato habeamus ab his auctoribus esse profecta quorum titulos gerunt. Id si est, damno ac rejicio dubitationem meam—plus apud me valet expressum Ecclesie judicium, quam ulla rationes humanae. Erasmi. Declar. ad Theol. Paris.*

(c) *Esse tamen pulcherrimam & insignem Epistolam à discipulo quodam Apostolorum scriptam. Raith. Vind. Verf. Germ. Luth. th. 22.*

cinus himself after he hath produced some Arguments (*d*) that give occasion to a scruple whether it appertains to this Apostle, adds that however it is no less Divine; he confesseth that it is not without reason that it is doubted whether the person to whom it is commonly attributed be certainly the Author: but he saith at the same time, that tho the name of an Author of a Book be not known, it doth not follow that this Book is of no authority, or even of less than if it were known. *Enjedinus* a subtil Unitarian insists also at large on this Subject when he examines some Passages of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, he relates all that he hath read thereupon in the Writings of *Erasmus*, and *Beza*, and of some other Commentators on the holy Scriptures. But after he hath too nicely alledged such Reasons as not only take away this Epistle from *S. Paul*, but also render it suspected, he doth not fail to reckon it in the number of the Canonical Books.

Georg. Enjed. loc. cor. Epist. ad Hebr.

It is well worth the observing, that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* is not so favourable to the Orthodox against the *Arians*, but that they have likewise made use of it against the Catholics to authorize their Novelties. This may be seen in the Works of *S. Epiphanius*, who takes notice that altho these Hereticks did not acknowledge it as an Apostolical Writing, yet they did not forbear to oppose the Faith of the Church with these words of this same Epistle, chap. 3. v. 1, 2. (*f*) Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, *Jesus Christ*; who was faithful to him that appointed him (*g*) From these words, who was faithful to him that appointed [or made] him, they concluded that *Jesus Christ* was a Creature.

As for the Language in which the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was composed, the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers have all judged that the Greek Text which we now have is too pure and elegant to be *S. Paul's*; but it cannot be necessarily concluded from thence that it was at first written in Hebrew or Chaldaick by this holy Apostle. I am rather inclined to believe with *Origen*, that it hath been compiled by one of the *Amanuenses* or Interpreters of *S. Paul*, to whom all

(*d*) *Videtur mihi ipsa in universum scribendi ratio auctoris illius Epistolæ admodum diversa ab eâ quâ quam secutus est Paulus, quamvis aequè divina.* Soc. de Auct. Script. Sac. n. 2.

(*e*) *Ingenue fateor de scripto hoc non sine causâ dubitari, num illius auctoris fuerit cui communione consensu tribuitur. Nihilominus tamen dico, etiamsi nomen auctoris alicujus scripti ignoretur, no tamen ejusmodi scriptum nullius auctoritatis existimandum esse, aut etiam minoris quàm si non ignoraretur.* Soc. ibid.

(*f*) *Διέξαδς τὸν ἀρχιερεῖα υἱοῦ τοῦ ὄντα τοῦ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν.* Epist. ad Hebr. cap. 3. v. 2.

(*g*) *Ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰρημῶς ὅτι πρὸς ὄντα τοῦ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, τὸ κτήμα παρὰ τῆς εὐνῆς.* Epiph. Hær. 69. n. 37.

Antiquity hath ascribed it, by reason of the Grandeur of the Conceptions in which there is a certain Art that could proceed only from a Learned *Jew* of the Sect of the *Pharisees*. The *Jews* themselves at this day who have any knowledge of their ancient Authors, do freely confess that there is something in it that is great and sublime. If we knew precisely to what sort of *Jews* it was directed, we might more easily judge of the Language in which it was written. But since this question is but of little moment, and we can have nothing but Conjectures thereupon, I shall not insist any longer on it.

CHAP. XVII.

Of the Catholick or Canonical Epistles in general, and in particular.

THE *Grecians* have called Catholick or universal the seven Epistles which we read under this Name; because for the most part they were not written to particular Churches, as those of *S. Paul*. The Title of Canonical seems to have been affected, especially in the Western Churches, because it hath been doubted whether some of them ought to be put in the number of the Canonical Books. Cardinal *Cajetan* hath thought that the Epistle of *S. James*, which is directed to the twelve Tribes of the *Jews* in general, (a) deserves rather the Name of a Book than of an Epistle, because it was not written to be carried to the *Jews* that were dispersed amongst divers Nations; but he is mistaken in this, for we write as well to Communities, even those that are separated in different Countries, as to particular Assemblies. And these Letters are called *Catholick*, *Catholick*, or Circulary.

The Author of the Preface at the beginning of the Canonical Epistles, which is attributed to *S. Jerom*, and is found in the most part of Manuscript Copies, and in the first *Latin* Editions of the Bible, hath observed (b) that the Order of these Epistles in his time was not

(a) *Magis libri quàm epistola titulum merebatur: scripta est enim non ut deferretur duodecim Tribubus dispersis, cum hoc esset impossibile, sed ad instruendum eos.* Cajet. Comm. in c. i. Epist. Jac.

(b) *Non ita est ordo apud Græcos qui integrè sapiunt, fidemque rectam sectantur, Epistolarum septem quæ Canonice nuncupantur, sicut in Latinis codicibus invenitur, ut quod Petrus primus in ordine Apostolorum, primæ sint etiam ejus Epistolæ in ordine cæterarum.* Hieron. Prolog. in VII. Epist. Can.

the same in the *Latin*, as in the *Greek* Copies of the Orthodox. The Epistle of *S. James* was the first in the *Greek*; whereas the *Latins* had placed that of *S. Peter* at the head of all the rest, having had regard to the Primacy of his Apostleship. This Author declares that he hath re-established their ancient Order, putting that of *St. James* at the beginning, and afterwards the two of *St. Peter*, the three of *St. John*, and at last that of *St. Jude*: this indeed is the Order that is found in the *Greek* Manuscript Copies, and even in the ancient *Latin* Bibles written about seven or eight hundred years ago. *St. Jerom* also hath followed this method in his great Prologue called *Galeatus*.

The *Syrians* have preserved this same Order in their Version, as appears from the Edition of *Widmanstadius*, nevertheless they have not in their ancient Copies (according to which this Edition of *Widmanstadius* was regulated) the second Epistle of *St. Peter*, nor the second and third of *St. John*, nor that of *St. Jude*. These Epistles were not apparently in the *Greek* Copies which the *Syrians* have Translated into their Language: However it seems as if there were nothing very certain concerning the Order of these Epistles; for in the last of the Canons that bear the name of the Apostles, those of *St. Peter* are set down first, and afterwards those of *St. John*, and that of *St. James* stands in the third rank: the Bishops assembled at *Trent* have also named them after this same manner, conformably to the Council of *Florence*. *Calvin* himself hath set the Epistle of *St. Peter* at the head of all, in his Commentaries on the Canonical Epistles. But we ought to prefer the Order that is observed in the *Greek* and *Latin* Copies, and also in the Oriental Versions.

As for what concerns the Authority of these Epistles, very great difficulties arise from thence; for as we have already seen, the *Syrians* have not inserted some of them in their Version of the New Testament, which they would have done if they had been read in the Eastern Churches, when they Interpreted them out of the *Greek* into *Syriack*, nevertheless they have since Translated them, and they have been likewise Printed; therefore they are also found in the *Arabick* Versions of the New Testament. I shall have occasion to examin this matter more exactly in the second Book of this Work, wherein I shall Treat of Versions in particular; but since my design at present is only to speak of the Text, let us see what the Ancients have thought thereupon.

Eusebius, who avoucheth (c) that the Epistle of *St. James*, the

(c) Οὐ πολλοὶ τῆς παλαιᾶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς ἐστὶ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰάκωβου ---
 ὅμως ὁ Ἰσίδωρος καὶ πάντες μὲν τῆς λοιπῆς ἐν πλείστοις δεδημοσιωμέναις ἐκκλησίαις.
Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. cap. 23.

Brother of our Saviour, with the other Canonical Epistles, was publickly read in his time in the most part of the Churches, observes nevertheless that not many of the ancient Writers have made mention of it, as neither of that of *St. Jude*; he would say, without doubt, that there are few of the ancient Doctors of the Church that have cited it as Canonical; therefore in another part of his History where he produceth a Catalogue of the Books of the New Testament, (*d*) he reckons the same Epistle of *St. James*, that of *St. Jude*, the second of *St. Peter*, and the second and third of *St. John* among the Scriptures that were not generally received as Canonical by all the Churches, though several ancient Fathers had spoken of them.

St. Jerom, who usually transcribes *Eusebius*, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, expresseth himself almost after the same manner as this Historian doth, on the Epistle of *St. James*; for after he hath said (*e*) that *St. James* the first Bishop of *Jerusalem* hath written but one Letter, which is in the number of the seven Canonical Epistles, he adds (to shew that all People were not agreed that it was certainly his) that it was said that it hath been written by another in his name, though it hath obtained Authority in process of time.

Cajet.
Comm. in
c. 1. Ep. st.
Jac.

Cardinal *Cajetan* makes use of this same Passage of *S. Jerom*, to prove that it is not absolutely certain that this Epistle was composed by *S. James* the Brother of our Lord; *Non usquequaque certum an Epistola hæc sit Jacobi fratris Domini*. He hath also entituled his Annotations on this Epistle, Commentaries on the Epistle that bears the Name of *S. James*; *In eam quæ Divo Jacobo inscribitur Commentarii*: in which point he is more scrupulous than *S. Jerom*, who hath made no difficulty to quote it under this Title. Indeed this Father simply relates in this place the various Opinions of several Persons concerning the Author of this Epistle: but forasmuch as it was read in the Churches under the Name of *S. James*, and it hath been read therein ever since that time, this Cardinal discovers too nice a curiosity, as well as when he adds in this very place, that the manner of saluting that is at the beginning of this

(d) Τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων, γνωρίμων δ' ἔν ὅμοις τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα, ἥτε Πέτρου δότις, καὶ πέτῃ Ἰωάννου. *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. cap. 25.*

(e) *Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini—unam tantum scripsit Epistolam, quæ de septem Catholicis est, quæ & ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita assertitur, licet paulatim tempore procedente obrinuerit auctoritatem.* Hieron. de Script. Eccl. in Jac.

(f) Epistle contains nothing Apostolical; on the contrary, that it is altogether profane, no mention being therein made of Jesus Christ, nor of Grace, nor Peace; and he doth not call himself (saith he) an Apostle, but a Servant of Jesus Christ.

Sixtus Senensis hath rehearsed these Words amongst the Objections that *Luther* hath made against this Epistle, and perhaps *Cajetan* hath taken the best part of these Expressions from him: but this Objection is so weak, and even so irrational, that the *Lutherans* have had no regard to it, no more than to divers other Reasons that their Master hath alledged against the Epistle of S. *James*; for they receive it at this day after the same manner as the Catholics: nevertheless, they are not to be excused in this respect, because they still retain in some Editions of their *German Bible*, the Prefaces of *Luther* that are at the beginning of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and of that of S. *James*, after they have admitted them as Canonical; for they disown by these Prefaces what they authorize in the body of their Bible.

I could have wished that *Melchior Canus*, and some other learned Divines, had not made use of the Authority of certain Decretal Epistles falsely attributed to the first Popes, to shew that ever since the Primitive Times of Christianity it hath been believed that this Epistle did certainly belong to S. *James*: there is no need of this sort of Proofs; for though the *Ancients* have been divided as to this Point, it is enough that the succeeding Ages, after a due reflection on this matter, have found in Antiquity certain Acts sufficient to justify the placing this Epistle of S. *James* in the rank of the Canonical Books of the New Testament, and that all the Churches of the World do at this day receive it as such.

Calvin, who hath been more moderate herein than *Luther*, hath chose rather to reconcile the Doctrine of S. *James*, touching Faith and Works, with that of S. *Paul*, than unadvisedly to reject this Epistle under colour that it appears to be contrary to the same S. *Paul*. To receive (saith he) this Epistle, this seems to me to be sufficient, that it contains nothing unworthy of an Apostle of Christ. The *Lutherans* themselves soon perceived that their Master sometimes gave out Opinions without a due consideration of what he affirmed. *Raithius*, who hath made an Apology for *Luther*, confesseth, that he had written in the first Edition of his *German Bible* to this effect,

(f) *Salutatio hic posita tam pura est, ut nulli salutationi cujuscunque alicuius Apostolicæ Epistolæ conformis sit, nam nihil Dei, nihil Jesu Christi, nihil gratiæ, nihilve pacis sonat, sed profano more salutem, nec ipse seipsum nominat Apostolum, sed tantum servum Jesu Christi.* Cajet. Comm. in c. 1. Epist. Jac.

that

that if this Epistle were compared with those of S. Peter and S. Paul it would appear only an Epistle of Straw, *Epistola straminea*: but, (g) after he had been more enlightned, these Words were taken away in the following Editions, and they are not to be found in those that have been made since the Year 1526. Nevertheless, a certain Lutheran published a Book at Strasbourg in the Year 1527, wherein he speaks after a strange manner of the Epistle of S. James. He affirms (b) that he cannot defend it, because the Author alledgeth false Quotations of the Scriptures, and alone contradicts the Law, the Prophets, Jesus Christ and the Apostles; he condemns the Testimony of this Writer as vain, boldly affirming that we ought not to believe him being a single Witness, especially since the Holy Ghost, and a great number of the Witnesses of the Truth, do dissent from him: lastly, this man, after he hath taken so much liberty to declaim against the Author of this Epistle, adds at the end of his Book, that none ought to be offended that he hath treated him so severely; for, (saith he) he deserves this hatred, because he hath proposed to us another Righteousness than that of Faith. Can there be any thing more insolent than the Words of this Sectary who durst oppose his false Conceptions against the Testimony of all the Churches of the World?

Socinus speaks with a great deal more moderation and judgment concerning the Authority of this Epistle. This Champion of the Unitarians declares that it was doubted in the beginning touching the Authors of the Epistle of S. James, of the second of S. Peter, and of that of S. Jude, because they were found after the Collection of the other Books of the New Testament had been made: but forasmuch as it was acknowledged afterwards that they were certain-

(g) Post majorem illuminationem, ut dies diem docet, verba illa duriuscula posterioribus Sacrorum Bibliorum editionibus sunt omissa, nec post annum 1526. in ullâ amplius editione straminea vocatur. Raith. Vind. Verf. Germ. Luth. th. 21.

(h) Non possumus hic defendere Jacobum: citat enim Scripturas falsò; & solus Spiritui Sancto, Legi, Prophetis, Christo Apostolisque omnibus contradicit. Testimonium ipsius vanum est. Uni ipsi testi credendum non esse supra annotavimus, præsertim cum quo ipse Spiritus Sanctus & tot testes veritatis dissentiant. Ne igitur succenseas nobis, lector, si durius & vehementius calamo quandoque in auctorem inveci sumus. Meretur enim hoc odium & hanc spiritus vehementiam, dum aliam perfectionem atque justitiam à nobis contendit quam fidei. Andr. Altham. apud Grot. de discuss. Rivet. Apolog. p. 722.

(i) Cum postea tempore procedente ex judiciis huic rei aptis cognitum fuisset istas Epistolas illorum ipsorum Apostolorum esse, exempta plerisque illa dubitatio fuit; & sic inter alias sunt numeratæ, & ea quidem quæ Jacobi est, ante duas reliquas. Soc. de auctor. Script. Sac. c. 1. n. 2.

ly composed by the Apostles whose Names they bore, the most part of the Churches did no longer doubt thereof; and the Epistle of S. James was placed before the two others: moreover, with respect to that of S. James, he proves the Antiquity of this Tradition by the ancient Syriack Copies. Therefore he doth not only receive them as Canonical, but believes also that they do certainly belong to them to whom they are attributed.

Although it be agreed that the first of these Catholick Epistles was written by S. James, nevertheless it remains to be known who this James is. The Title of this Epistle doth not resolve this difficulty, because it is different according to the various Greek Copies: and indeed we ought not to relye on this sort of Titles that are later than the Authors of the Books. It is read simply in some Manuscript Copies, 'Επιστολὴ καὶ καθολικὴ τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰακώβου, *The Catholick Epistle of S. James*; and in others, 'Επιστολὴ τοῦ ἀγίου ἀποστόλου Ἰακώβου καὶ καθολικὴ, *The Catholick Epistle of the Apostle S. James*. This is also the Title that hath been prefixed in the Vulgar Latin, *Epistola Catholica beati Jacobi Apostoli*, and which Beza hath retained in his Greek Edition of the New Testament, where we read Ἰακώβου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐπιστολὴ καὶ καθολικὴ, *The Catholick Epistle of the Apostle James*. But Robert Stephen, in his curious Greek Edition of the New Testament in folio, hath simply put Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολὴ καὶ καθολικὴ, *The Catholick Epistle of James*. It is no otherwise in Crespin's Edition at Geneva in the Year 1565. It is read according to the same sense, 'Επιστολὴ τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰακώβου, *The Epistle of S. James*, in that of Wolfius at Strasbourg in 1524. We read also after the same manner in the Edition of Melchior Sessa at Venice in 1538, and in that of Simon de Colines at Paris in 1534, and in many others. This is most natural and most conformable to the Greek Text, where S. James, at the beginning of his Epistle, takes upon him no other Quality than that of a *Servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ*.

Therefore Grotius hath also preserved this same Title, and he hath reason not to approve the Opinion of those that attribute it to James the Son of Zebedee, because this James had been put to Death by Herod before the Gospel of Jesus Christ was much spread abroad beyond Judea: neither doth he believe that James the Son of Alphaeus was the Author of it, because he would have taken at the beginning of his Epistle the Name of an Apostle, which was a quality in those Primitive Times that gave a great Authority to their Words: from whence he concludes, that it ought to be ascribed to that James whom the Apostles constituted first Bishop of Jerusalem. This is not very far from the Words of S. Jerom in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, *James, who is called the Brother*

Cod. MS.
Bibl. Reg.
n. 2872.

Hieron.
de Script.
Eccles. in
of Jac.

of our Lord, and surnamed the Just, as some think, was the Son of Joseph by another Wife; but according to my Opinion, of Mary the Sister of our Lord, of whom John makes mention in his Book: he was ordained Bishop of Jerusalem by the Apostles immediately after the Passion of our Lord, and hath written one Letter only, which is in the number of the seven Catholick Epistles. He doth not nominate this James as an Apostle, but only as the Brother of our Lord, which is the sole Qualification that is given him by the Arabick Interpreter published by Erpenius, in the Title of this Epistle.

S. Jerom hath said nothing in this place but what is agreeable to the judgment of Hegesippus a grave Author, who lived not long after the times of the Apostles. This great man hath observed, that divers Persons at that time bore the Name of James, and saith of this James (of whom we now discourse) (k) that being the Brother of our Lord, he took the Government of the Church of Jerusalem jointly with the Apostles; that the Name of Just was also given to him with one common Consent, which was continued ever since the time of our Saviour Jesus Christ: Hegesippus then did not believe that he was an Apostle, forasmuch as he saith that he took upon him the care of the Church of Jerusalem with the Apostles; and he distinguisheth him from others that went under the Name of James, only by the Sirname of Just.

In the mean time Baronius, and after him Esimus, declare that this third James, distinguished from the two others, who was simply Bishop of Jerusalem without being an Apostle, is a chimerical James that never was. But since this Cardinal grounds his Opinion on very weak Reasons, and contradicts Antiquity in this point, no regard ought to be had to what he affirms against the Judgment of Hegesippus and S. Jerom, and even against the Testimony of the Author of this Epistle, who would not have failed to have stiled himself an Apostle of Jesus Christ in the beginning of his Letter, if he had been really so.

Cajet.
Comm. in
c. 1. Epist.
Jac.

This may serve at the same time for a sufficient Answer to Cardinal Cajetan, who hath objected, to derogate from the Authority of this Epistle, that this James hath not taken upon him the Name of an Apostle, but only that of a Servant; *nec ipse seipsum nominat Apostolum, sed tantum servum*. As to what this Cardinal saith in the same place, that this Writer hath made no mention of God, nor of

(k) Διακρίνη δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας μετ' αὐτῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ καλεῖται Ἰακώβος ὁ ὀνομασθεὶς ἀπὸ πάντων Νίχουτος ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ δὲ καλεῖται χεββὼν αἰσχεῖ καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ πολλοὶ Ἰακώβος ἐκαλεῖται. Hegesipp. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. c. 23.

Jesus Christ, the contrary is apparent from the first Words of this Epistle, in which he attributes to himself no other Quality than that of *Ἰδνωθ' οὐκ ἔχω ἐν ἑαυτῷ Χριστὸν δούλον*, *James a Servant of God and* *Jac. 1. v. 1.* of the Lord Jesus Christ. He could not have chosen a Title that might better express his Qualifications, especially writing to the Jews, who were already accustomed by the reading of the Old Testament to the Phrase of the Servant of God: and when he adds these other Words, *and of the Lord Jesus Christ*, he lets them know that he is one of the Ministers of the new Law that had been promulged by the *Messiah*.

Lastly we may observe, that in the Title of the *Syriack* Version these Words are read, *The Epistle of James an Apostle*; it is no otherwise in the *Ethiopick* Version: but in the general Title of the three *Catholick* Epistles which the *Syrians* have in their ancient Copies, we read that these three Epistles were written by *James, Peter, and John, who were the Witnesses of the Transfiguration of our Lord*. This would prove that this *James* was the Son of *Zebedee*; but it is a manifest error of the *Syrians*, who have inserted this Inscription into their Copy.

As for what relates to the Epistles of *S. Peter* and *S. John*, *Euseb. Euseb. vius* puts the first Epistles of these two Apostles in the number of *Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 25.* the Canonical Books of the New Testament, that have been received with the common Consent of all the Churches: but he observes at the same time, that there hath been some doubt concerning the Second of *S. Peter*, as well as of the Second and Third of *S. John*. *S. Jerom* adds, (1) that that which hath caused the Ancients to doubt of the second Epistle of *S. Peter*, is the difference of the Style of these two Epistles.

We cannot rely on the Testimony of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who reckons in the number of the Canonical Writings of the New Testament all the Epistles that we call *Catholick*; for he placeth amongst them, at the same time, the Epistle of *Barnabas*, and the Book entituled, *The Revelation of Peter*, *τὸ πρὸς Πέτρον ἀποκάλυψις*. *Clem. Al. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 14.* This Father, who was an extraordinary learned man, hath not been very exact in distinguishing the Books of the Holy Scriptures that were generally received by all the Churches, from the others that are either dubious or *Apocryphal*: he makes use of all equally on several occasions; following in this the method

(1) *Simon Petrus* — scripsit duas Epistolas quæ Catholica nominantur, quarum secunda à plerisque negatur propter stili cum priore dissonantiam. Hier. de Script. Eccl. in Sim. Pet.

of the ancient Rhetoricians, who took no care to be very punctual in their Argumentations.

Origen, his Disciple, durst not altogether venture to rank the abovesaid Epistles amongst the Canonical Scriptures: and whereas they had not obtained in his time the general Approbation of all the Christian World, he explains himself thereupon with a great deal of Precaution. (m) Peter, (saith he) *on whom the Church of Jesus Christ is built, hath left an Epistle which is generally received, and a second if you please; for it is doubted.* (n) John hath likewise left a very short Epistle, and a second and third if you please; but all people are not agreed that these two last are genuine. This proves that the Church hath never doubted of the Authority of the first Epistles of these two Apostles, and that they were certainly composed by them whose Names they bear; moreover, that although some have doubted of the others, yet this Scruple was not universal, since Origen agrees that they were received as really belonging to these Apostles to whom they were attributed.

The Author of the *Synopsis* of the Holy Scriptures makes no question thereof; he avoucheth, (o) that the second Epistle of S. Peter was written by this Apostle as well as the first, and that he sent it to those that had then embraced Christianity.

Cajetan, who hath started so many Difficulties against the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and against that of S. James, is much more moderate with respect to this: he insists, that the Argument that is taken from the difference of the Style of the two Epistles of S. Peter, is not a sufficient proof to shew that the second is not his; (p) because this Reason might as well be applied to the first as to the second: but this Cardinal hath not considered that it was never doubted in any Church whether the first Epistle of S. Peter was certainly written by him; and therefore from this Act which is unquestionable we should judge of the other that hath not the same

(m) Πέτρος ὃ ἐφ' ᾧ οἰκοδομεῖται ἡ ἑκκλησία. — μὴν ὁπισθίου ὁμολογῶν ἑαυτὸν καταλείπειν. ἔστι δὲ καὶ δευτέραν ἀμφιβόλην. Orig. apud Euf. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 25.

(n) Καταλείπει δὲ (Ἰωάννης) καὶ ὁπισθίου πέντε ὀλίγων στίχων. ἔστι δὲ καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην. ἐπεὶ ἔ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας. Orig. ibid.

(o) Ὁμοίως καὶ αὐτὴ πρὸς τὸ αὐτὸ γεγραμμένη τὴν τέτην ἔχει ὀνομασίαν. αὐτὴς δὲ Πέτρος καὶ ταύτην ἐπέστειλε τοῖς ἡδὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν. Athan. in Syn. Scrip. S.

(p) Hæc ratio non minus infert primam quam secundam non esse Petri: nam tantum dissonat prima à secunda, quantum secunda à prima. Cajet. præf. Contin. in post. Epist. Pet.

certainty.

certainty. If the diversity of Stile only be a sure Touch-stone whereby the verity of a Piece may be tryed, the reason of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers taken from the difference of the Stile, and related by *S. Jerom*, is a good proof to shew that the second Epistle ascribed to *S. Peter* is not this Apostle's. That which *Cajetan* adds in the same place, that a diversity of Stile doth not necessarily infer a diversity of Authors, is on much better grounds. It is certain, that *St. Jerom*, who acknowledged this diversity of Stile, hath attributed it to the different Interpreters of *St. Peter*: he supposeth that *St. Peter* did not write his Epistles in *Greek* himself, but that he had Interpreters with him who understood that Language: mention is also made in the New Testament of those that exercised the Function of Interpreters in those Primitive and Apostolical Times.

According to this Opinion, which is maintained by the ancient Doctors of the Church, *St. Jerom* saith, (q) that *St. Peter* hath made use of divers Interpreters as different Occasions required. *Baronius* hath concluded from thence, that this Father believed that *Saint Mark* had translated the first Epistle of *Saint Peter* out of *Hebrew* into *Greek*; but *Saint Jerom* only declares in this place, that the Apostles who did not very well express themselves in the *Greek* Tongue, employed Scribes or Interpreters.

Calvin, after he hath a little enlarged on this diversity of Stile, which seems to denote a difference between the Authors of these two Epistles, doth not forbear to acknowledge the second as Divine and Canonical. However it be (saith he) since in all the parts of the Epistle the Majesty of the Spirit of Christ is clearly manifest, I cannot in conscience reject it altogether, though I do not find therein the true and natural Phrase of *Saint Peter*. *Flaccius Illyricus* hath written Notes on this Epistle, without doubting in the least whether it was made by him whose Name it bears.

Grotius hath chosen rather to attribute it to another *Simeon* or *Simon* the Successor of *St. James* in the Bishoprick of *Jerusalem*, than to *Simon Peter*: He believes that the ancient Title of this Epistle hath been changed, and that it was not *Simon Peter* a Servant and an Apostle of *Jesus Christ*, as it is read at this day; but simply *Simeon* a Servant of *Jesus Christ*: there would be some likelihood

(q) Ex quo intelligimus pro necessitate rerum diversum cum usum interpretibus.
Hieron. Epist. ad Hedi. qu. 11.

of this, if it were grounded on any Manuscript Copies or ancient Acts; but he only confirms his Opinion by a Critical Argument that is not concluding: he urgeth, that this Epistle, at least the third Chapter of it, could not have been written till after the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, because mention is therein made of the entire ruin of the World, which was impatiently expected by the Christians of those times. Now *S. Peter* died under *Nero*. No Christian (saith *Grotius*) could look for this last Destruction of the World, till after that of the State of the *Jews*.

But it doth not follow from thence, that *Jerusalem* ought to have been then destroyed; for this Persuasion was generally received amongst the Disciples of *Jesus Christ*, whilst he was yet living: ever since that time they waited with Impatience for his happy Reign, which could not be established (as they thought) but on the ruin of the State of the *Jews*: therefore when *Jesus Christ* speaks to them; Chap. xxiv. of *S. Matthew*, of the ruin of the Temple, he mixeth some things concerning his coming. (r) *The Apostles* (saith *Maldonat*) thought that the end of the Temple, and the end of the World were necessarily joined together. *Jesus Christ* would not undeceive them, lest after the destruction of the Temple, seeing their Expectations deferred they might grow negligent and secure.

S. Peter then might have written this Epistle before the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and might have declared to the Faithful in the third Chapter thereof, that *Jesus Christ* had not delayed the accomplishment of his word, as some amongst them imagined. The Primitive Christians expected with impatience the ruin of the Temple, and thought that the general destruction of the whole World would follow soon after: *S. Peter* exhorts them in this place to wait patiently, because *One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day*. Therefore the Conjecture of *Grotius* seems to have no better Foundation than that of *Didymus*, who lived at the beginning of the fourth Century, and hath rejected this Epistle as supposititious, because mention is made (as he thinks) in this same Chap. 3. of I know not what renovation of the world conformably to the Opinion of the *Platonick* Philosophers. But there is nothing in this whole Chapter that doth not perfectly agree with the Doctrine of the Primitive Christians touching the end of the World.

2 Pet. 3.
v. 8.

Didym.
Comm. in
Epist. 2.
Pet.

(r) *Existimabant Apostoli hac esse conjuncta finem templi & finem mundi. Nihil Christus hunc illis errorem eripere, ne post templi eversionem in longum expectationem porrigentes securi essent.* Mald. Comm. in c. 24. Matth. v. 25.

It is not necessary to spend much time in insisting on the second and third Epistles of S. *John*, of which it hath been also doubted in the Primitive Ages of the Church. *Papias*, who lived with the Disciples of the Apostles, distinguisheth two *Johns*, who have dwelt in *Asia*, the first of which is our Apostle, and the other was a Priest and Disciple of the Apostles.

Pap. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 29.

Papias, who was the Disciple of this last *John*, ascribes to him no other quality than that of a Priest; and this hath caused divers Ecclesiastical Writers to believe, that he was the Author of the second and third Epistles attributed to the Apostle S. *John*. Indeed he doth not take the name of Apostle, but simply that of Priest or Elder, ἱερεὺς ἢ πρεσβύτερος.

Eusebius relying on the Testimony of *Papias*, approves the Opinion of those that believed that there were two persons in *Asia* that were called by the name of *John*: this Persuasion was further confirmed, in regard that there was yet seen in his time at *Ephesus* two Tombs of *John*. S. *Jerom*, who often translates the words of *Eusebius* out of Greek into Latin, hath also made this same Remark, *Reliquæ autem duæ*; (saith he, speaking of these two Epistles of S. *John*) *Joannis Presbyteri asseruntur, cujus hodie alterum sepulcrum apud Ephesum ostenditur*. He adds nevertheless that some thought that these two Monuments were of S. *John* the Evangelist, *Nonnulli putant duas memorias ejusdem Joannis Evangelistæ esse*. He repeats this same History when he makes mention of *Papias*, and saith (f) that he relates it for the sake of a great number of persons that believed that this second *John*, to whom the simple name of Priest is given, was the Author of these two Epistles, and not the Apostle.

Euseb. ib.

Hieron. de Script. Eccl. in Joann.

However, the Author of the *Synopsis* of the Holy Scriptures attributes these two last Epistles no less to the Apostle S. *John* than the first. And it seems that the Latin Church that reads it in her Offices under the same Name, hath authorised this Opinion, which is likewise conformable to the Testimony of the most ancient Writers of this Church. Therefore the Name of this Apostle, *Beati Joannis Apostoli*, is retained in the Latin Title of these three Epistles in the vulgar Edition. In the Syriack Copy of these two last Epistles that have been Printed in the Polyglott Bible of *England*, the simple Name of *John* is put; whereas in the first it is read of *John* the Apostle. This seems to have been done on purpose to distinguish the

Athan. in Synopsis.

(f) *Hoc autem diximus propter superiorem opinionem, quam à plerisque retulimus traditam, duas posteriores Epistolas Joannis non Apostoli esse, sed Presbyteri.*
Hieron. de Script. Eccl. in Papiâ.

Authors of these Epistles. In the *Arabick* Copy published by *Erpanius*, these three Epistles are ascribed to the Apostle *S. John*, who is named in the Title of the two first, *John the son of Zebedee*, and in the Title of the third, *John the Apostle*.

*Euseb.
Hist. Eccl.
lib. 3.
c. 25.*

Lastly, there have been raised no less doubts in the Primitive Ages of the Church, concerning the Epistle of *S. Jude*, than of the preceding Letters; for this reason *Eusebius* hath reckoned it in the number of those Books of the New Testament that were not generally received by all the Churches. *S. Jerom* who hath made the same observation, (t) adds, that that which gave occasion to reject it, was the Apocryphal Book of *Enoch*, which is cited therein. And that this nevertheless hath not hindered it from being placed in the rank of the Sacred Books, its Antiquity and Use having given it this Authority. In like manner it hath been generally received by all the Churches, as well Eastern as Western. The Unitarians and Protestants also have put it amongst the other Canonical Books of the New Testament.

Calv. argum. de Jes Comm. sur l'ep. de Sainte Jude.

Luther hath nevertheless doubted of it, as well as of the Epistle of *St. James*: but they that follow his Opinion, are so far from rejecting it at present, that they use their utmost endeavours to put a fair Construction on their Masters words. *Calvin* after he hath acknowledged that the Ancients have differed very much amongst themselves touching this Epistle, expresseth himself thus; *However because the reading of it is very profitable, and it contains nothing but what is agreeable to the purity of the Apostolical Doctrine: and in regard also that it hath been accounted Authentick for a long time amongst all good People, for my part I willingly place it in the number of the other Epistles.*

Grot. Annot. in Epist. Jud.

Cajetan hath inferred from the above cited words of *St. Jerom*, (u) that this Epistle is of less Authority than these Writings of the Apostles, of the verity of which we have been certainly assured: but this might have been properly said in those ancient times when it was not approved by all the Churches: whereas when this Cardinal wrote, there were none that did not receive it as Divine and Canonical: and therefore it hath no less Authority than the other Sacred Books that are comprehended in the Canon of the Church.

Grotius did not believe that this Epistle was written by *St. Jude* the

(t) *Judas frater Jacobi parvam quæ de septem Catholicis est epistolam reliquit: & quia de libro Enoch qui apocryphus est in ea assumis testimonium, à plerisque rejicitur. Tamen auctoritatem vetustate jam & usu meruit, & inter Scripturas Sacras computatur. Hieron. de Script. Eccles. in Judæ.*

(u) *Ex quibus apparet minoris esse auctoritatis hanc Epistolam iis quæ sunt certæ Scripturæ Sacra. Cajet. Comm. in Epist. Judæ.*

Apostle, because the Author hath taken upon him only the quality of a *Servant of Jesus Christ*, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ 'Ἰνοῦ δ'ὑλῶ he saith more over that (x) if it were certainly esteemed Apostolical, it would have been Translated into all Languages, and received by all the Churches: therefore he judgeth that it belongs to *Jude Bishop of Jerusalem*, who lived under the Emperor *Adrian*. But the first words of this Epistle do declare to us that it can come from no other hand than that of the *Apostle St. Jude*, since he calls himself, *Jude the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James*. For to say with *Grotius*, that these words *Brother of James*, have been afterwards added by the Transcribers that it might be believed that this *Jude* was certainly an Apostle, is to beg the question; they that would prove that this hath been inserted by the Transcribers ought to produce good Copies of this Epistle, or certain ancient Acts on which we might rely. Any Man that should have a mind absolutely to reject the Epistle of *St. Jude*, might easily say with as much reason as *Grotius*, that he that hath forged it, hath put therein the name of *Jude the Brother of James*. Therefore Arguments that are purely Critical ought never to be opposed against Acts that are ancient and generally received by all the World.

It is true that the Epistle of *St. Jude* is less quoted by the ancient Doctors of the Church, than the most part of the other Books of the New Testament, and that it is not found in the ancient Copies of the *Syriack* Version. But it can be only concluded from thence, that it was not at first received in all the Churches: it might however have been published ever since the Primitive times of the Christian Religion, under the name of *St. Jude the Brother of James*, and yet not be Translated into all the Languages of the Churches, because it was then doubted in the most part of these Churches, whether it was his whose name it bore, *Clemens Alexandrinus* hath placed it amongst the other Books of the Holy Scriptures; but as it hath been already observed, that this Father hath inserted in his Catalogue some Pieces that were not Canonical, though they passed under the names of the Apostles; it can only be inferred from thence that at least ever since the time of *Clement*, this Epistle was attributed to the Apostle *St. Jude*. When *Eusebius* makes mention of it in his Ecclesiastical History, he doth not set it in the rank of coun-

(x) Si Apostolica fuisset habita hæc Epistola, versa fuisset in linguas omnes, & recepta per omnes Ecclesias. Grot. Annot. in Epist. Jud.

terfeit Acts, but of those concerning which some Churches have doubted, nevertheless there are none at this day that do not acknowledge it as Divine and Canonical: It is intituled in the *Syriack* Copy which hath been Printed, *The Letter of Jude the Brother of James*: neither hath it any other Title in the *Arabick* Version published by *Erpenius*. In the *Arabick* Printed in the Polyglott Bible of *England*, is intituled *The Catholick Epistle of the blessed Jude, the Brother of the Lord*.

The End of the First Part.



The Second Part will be Published in Five Days.

A
CRITICAL
HISTORY

Of the TEXT of the
New Testament;

WHEREIN

Is firmly Establish'd the Truth of those
Acts on which the Foundation of
CHRISTIAN RELIGION is laid.

PART II.

By *Richard Simon*, Priest.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *R. Taylor*, . MDCLXXXIX.

A
HISTORY
OF THE

New Testament

THE
OF THE
OF THE
OF THE



PART II

BY

Printed for R. Taylor, M.D. 1712

A

CRITICAL HISTORY
OF THE
New Testament.

PART II.

CHAP. XVIII.

A Critical Observation on a Passage in S. John's First Epistle, Chap. v. vers. 7. which is wanting in the most Greek Copies, Eastern Editions, and the most ancient Latin Copies. The Preface to the Canonical Epistles in some Latin Bibles, under the name of S. Jerome, was not penn'd by that Father. It cannot be proved that S. Cyprian had the Passage of S. John's Epistle in his Copy.

THE Reflections which many Learned Men have made on that Passage in the First Epistle of S. John, Chap. v. vers. 7. have not discouraged me from examining it afresh, and consulting the most part of the Greek and Latin Manuscripts that I could find about the same. The Greeks at this day, in their Copy intituled *Ἀποστόλων*, read (as the Latin Church) these words (a) *For there are three that bear witness in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* Yet 'tis

(a) Ὅτι ἦσαν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τοῦ ὕδατος, ὁ πατήρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· καὶ οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσιν. 1 Joann. c. 5. v. 7.

hard to find among the Greeks any Manuscript Copies that have that Passage; I speak not only of the Ancients, but also of those of the latter times. *Erasmus* alledged the Greeks had their Books more correct than the Latin Copies, but he is mistaken, as it shall appear by what follows in this Discourse. 'Tis much more probable, that that Doctrinal Point was formerly written the Margin, by way of Scollum or Note, but afterward inserted in the Text by those who transcribed the Copies. Such were my thoughts when I perused some of the Greek Editions; and there is no less probability, that it was supplied after the same manner in the ancient Latin Copies; which nevertheless happened not till after *S. Jerom's* time, who is not the Author of that Addition, which *Socinus*, next to *Erasmus*, had laid to his charge.

After the most diligent search in the King's Library, and that of Mr. *Colbert*, in which there are a great many good Manuscript Volumes, I found no Copy that had that Passage in it, tho I read seven of them in the Royal Library, six whereof are marked 1885. 2247. 2248. 2870. 2871. 2872. Some of the Manuscripts have Notes; but no Scholiast or Annotator does make mention of that Passage, neither have I found it in five Manuscript Copies belonging to Mr. *Colbert's* Library, which are marked 871. 6123. 4785. 6584. 2844. Yet some of these Manuscripts are only in Paper, and much later than the rest. There is also one in 16, well written, and I believe since the Impression: Yet the Passage in question is not found therein, any more than in the rest of the ancient Copies.

Codd.

MSS.

Bibl. Reg.

Codd.

MSS.

Bibl. Colbert.

I could produce yet other Greek Manuscript Copies which I have seen, whose various Readings I observed; but that which most deserves our notice, is that in the Margin of some of the King's and Mr. *Colbert's* Copies, there are small Notes set over against the said Passage, which in all likelihood have slipped afterwards into the Body of the Text. Take an Example from the King's Copy, marked 2247. over against these words, *Ὁν θεὸς εἰς τὴν ἐκ μαρτυρίας ἐν τῇ γῇ, τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα*, there is this Remark, *τῶν τριῶν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον καὶ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸς*. By which we may perceive that the Author of the said Remark, understood *The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost*, to be signified by the Three Witnesses mentioned by *S. John*, *The Spirit, the Water, and the Blood*: And what was formerly written by way of Note, passed afterwards into the Text, as it often falls out. In the same Copy over against these other words, *καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰς*, this Note is added, *Τῶν τριῶν ὁ θεὸς εἰς θεὸς*, that is, *One Deity, One God*. That Manuscript is about 500 Years old, and there are but very few places therein that have Notes. There is the like Remark in one of the Manuscripts belonging to Mr. *Colbert's* Library,

Numb.

Numb. 871. For besides these words that are set in the Margin, *ὁ Θεὸς μία Θεότης, One God, One Deity*; the Scholiast has also added these, *μαρτυρεῖ τὸ Θεὸν τὸ πατρὸς καὶ τὸ υἱὸν μετὰ τὸν*, *The testimony of God the Father, and of the Holy Ghost.*

This, in my opinion, is the original of the Passage in question, which 'tis very hard to find in the Greek Manuscript Copies, tho at this day they read it in their Version. This is much more likely than what *Erasmus* alledges; that the Greek Copies he had occasion to inspect, were much more correct than the Latin, which obliged that judicious person to omit the forementioned Passage in his first Editions of the New Testament; in which he was not altogether to be blamed, not being obliged to insert in the Impression what he could not find in any of his Manuscripts; He has nevertheless been charged with a design of favouring the *Arrian* Party by the omission. *James Lopes Stunica* has mightily accused him for his unlucky rejecting the said Passage in his Edition, (b) supposing that the Greek Copies had been corrupted in that place. But this Spanish Critick, who had read ancient Manuscripts, does not quote any to justify his own Sentiments: He contents himself with an Appeal he makes to *S. Jerome's* Preface to the Canonical Epistles, from which he proves that the Passage was extant in the ancient Greek Copies, out of which that Father compiled his ancient Latin Edition.

We must in this place know, that the Greek Copies are notoriously corrupted, and that ours contain the very truth, as they were translated from the Original.

Erasmus in his answer to *Stunica*, does vindicate himself well enough by the authority of those Greek Copies he had; yet he was wrought upon by some other consideration, contrary to the Authority of all his Manuscripts, to insert the Passage of *S. John* in a new Edition of his New Testament. He declares that what obliged him to make that Change, was his seeing a Greek Copy in *England*, which he believed was more perfect than any Latin Edition. I shall afterwards shew that he is mistaken, in believing that the Greeks reformed their Copies of the New Testament to a degree of perfection, above those of the Latins, after their Reunion with the *Roman* Church.

If that were so, as that judicious Person does suppose, with what warrant and freedom could he correct his Greek Edition by one single Copy, which as he himself believed, had suffered some alter-

(b) *Sciendum est hoc loco Græcorum codices apertissime esse corruptos; nostros verò veritatem ipsam ut à primâ origine traducti sunt continere: quod ex Prologo Beati Hieronymi super Epistolas Canonicas manifestè apparet. Jac. Lop. Stunica. Annot. in Eras.*

tion. He does disparage his own judgment, by inveighing against S. *Jerome*, as if that Father had been the Author of the Addition that is found in the Latin Copies, in which there are these words, *Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant in celo, Pater, Verbum & Spiritus Sanctus, & hi tres unum sunt*; i. e. Because there are three who bear witness in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. (c) He on this occasion brings a heavy Charge against him, as being more forward than wise; that is to say, if the matter be referred to *Erasmus's* judgment, S. *Jerome* must stand chargeable with Forgery, a bold and presumptuous undertaking to correct the ancient Latin Edition according to his own fancy, without the Authority of good Copies.

Faustus Socinus knew very well what advantage to make of this Answer of *Erasmus*; but withal adds, that (d) S. *Jerome* might have had one or more Copies, in which this Addition might be so managed, as to make it a hard matter to discover the Fraud, and that this is the reason obliged him to maintain that additional Passage against the Authority of so many Copies. In this manner that Unitary argues, according to his custom, with more subtilty than solidity. But Reason alone is not sufficient to judg of such matters; for besides that, 'tis necessary to be well acquainted with, and to examin strictly such Writings as are on publick record, and may give light in this affair. If *Erasmus*, who had read many Greek and Latin Copies of the New Testament, and frequently consulted S. *Jerome's* Manuscripts, had applied himself to a strict examination of the Preface to the Canonical Epistles, which he thinks was written by that Father, he would rather have been inclined to reject that Preface, as supposititious, than to charge S. *Jerome* with Forgery.

*Hieron.
Prolog.
in VII. E.
pist. Can.
ex edit.
Paris. ann.
1523.*

'Tis not amiss to set down in this place some part of the Preface to the Canonical Epistles, that is thought to be S. *Jerome's*, which is only found in the first Latin Editions of the Bible with this Title. *Incipit prologus beati Hieronymi presbyteri in septem Epistolas Canonicas.* i. e. The beginning of the Preface of S. *Jerome* the Presbyter, to the seven Canonical Epistles.

(c) Ille sepe numero violentus est parumque sibi pudens, sepe variis parumque sibi constans. *Erasm. Apol. adv. Stun.*

(d) Hieronymus, ut is qui, ut recte de eo Erasmus alicubi scribit, non satis prudenter sepe ad victoriam & ad cause sue defensionem & favorem multa traherat, nactus forte exemplar aliquod, aut etiam plura exemplaria in quibus particula ista adjecta fuerat, ut fraus animadverti non posset, adversus fidem aliorum omnium exemplarium tam Latinorum quam Græcorum lectionem particulae istius tanquam germanam defendere & promovere capit, conquerens publice eam culpâ & fraude hæreticorum abrasam à vulgatis codicibus fuisse. *Soc. Comm. in 1 Joann. c. 5. v. 7.*

The

The Author complains, that Interpreters have not faithfully translated those Epistles, (e) especially that place of S. John's First Epistle, Chap. v. vers. 7. where there is mention made of the Unity of Persons in the Blessed Trinity. He accuses those unfaithful Translators of falling into great Errors, whilst they retained in their Version these words only, *The Water, the Blood, and the Spirit*, and left out the words, *The Father, and the Spirit*, which are an authentic Testimony of the Catholick Faith, about the Myſtery of the Trinity.

The Bishop of Oxford, who has lately published a new Edition of S. Cyprian's Works with Observations, makes mention of a great number of Latin Bibles, where S. Jerome's supposed Preface is found: In the mean time he complains, that it is left out of the Latin Bibles that are printed in our Age. (f) *Let those* (says that learned Bishop) *who are men of Judgment determin, if that omission happened by chance, or was the effect of some bad Design.* He could not imagine for what reasons it was taken from the last Editions of the Latin Bible, since he found it in the Manuscript Copies, and almost in all the ancient Impressions: *Libris manuscriptis passim & fere omnibus codicibus impressis antiquioribus.*

But 'tis not just to accuse, upon this account, those who were concerned in the Translation of the Latin Bibles without that Preface. This is true, that it is found with other Prefaces of S. Jerome to the Bible, in such Latin Copies as have been made not above six Hundred Years ago, and in all probability the first Latin Bibles were printed according to such Manuscripts.

But 'tis not altogether so in those that were written about seven or eight Hundred Years ago, but in some few only of such Copies: And 'tis very likely that as to the rest, there was a Regulation made, according to the later Manuscripts in such Editions of the Bible, as have not that Preface. 'Tis further observable, that neither the Name of S. Jerome, nor of any other Writer, is prefixt to the Preface, in some of the ancient Copies where it is found, which sufficiently shews, that we may on good grounds question S. Jerome's being the Author of it.

(e) Illo præcipue loco ubi de unitate Trinitatis in primâ Joannis Epistolâ positum legimus. In quâ etiam ab infidelibus translatoribus multum erratum esse à fidei veritate comperimus, trium tantummodò vocabula, hoc est, aque, sanguinis & spiritûs in ipsâ suâ editione ponentibus, & Patris ubique ac Spiritûs testimonium omittentibus, in quo maxime & fides Catholica roboratur, & Patris & Filii & Spiritûs Sancti una Divinitatis substantia comprobatur. Hieron. Prol. in VII. Epist. Can.

(f) Utrum hoc ex casu an maleficio contigerit dispiciant eruditi. Joann. Oxon. Episc. Not. in Cypr. de unit. Eccl.

Cod. MSS.
Bibl. Reg.

Cod. MSS.
Bibl. Be-
nedict.
S. Germ.
Paris.

The Preface in controversy is not in a certain Manuscript Copy of the whole Bible, that is in the Royal Library, marked 3564. and has been extant these seven Hundred Years; neither is it in two other Manuscript Copies of the like antiquity, belonging to the Library of the *Benedictine* Monks of the Abby of *S. Germain*. It is found I confess in *Charles le Chauve's* fair Bible that is in the King's Library; but *S. Jerome's* Name is not there, any more than it is in some other ancient Copies.

Whoever will take the pains to compare the most of the ancient Latin Bibles together, shall easily discover, that he who gathered all the Books of the Latin Bible into one Body, (the better part of which was translated or revised by *S. Jerome*) is really the Author of that Preface. Since he was not furnished with that Father's Preface to all those Books, he supplied, in his Collection, what was wanting with an addition of some of his own compofure, and others, which he gathered from *S. Jerome's* Works. Hence, for example, in *Charles le Chauve's* Copy, there is, before the Acts of the Apostles, a Preface with this Title, *Præfatio Hieronymi*: Yet 'tis certain, that *S. Jerome* was not the Author of that Preface to the Acts, as it is there in exprefs words, but the Author of the Collection of the Books of the Latin Bible, took the same out of that Father's large Preface, entituled *Prologus Galeatus*; and it is expreffed in these words, *Actus Apostolorum nudam quidem resanare historiam videntur, & nascentis Ecclesiæ historiam texere: Sed si noverimus scriptorem eorum Lucam esse Medicum, cujus laus in Evangelio, animadvertemus pariter omnia verba illius animæ languentis esse Medicinam*: that is, *The Acts of the Apostles seem to be a bare History, affording us a prospect of the Church in its Birth: But if we consider that the Writer was Luke the Physician, who is famous in the Gospel, we shall also perceive, that all his words are the Medicine of a languishing Soul*. 'Tis also probable, that the Compiler of the Books of the Latin Version, which we call the Vulgar, not finding in *S. Jerome* a particular Preface to the Canonical Epistles, made one according to that Father's Stile, some of whose Expressions he has made use of, and amongst others, has inserted that word *Eusochium*.

'Tis likewise probable, that the Addition of the *Witness of three Persons* was extant before that time, in some Copies of *S. John's* Epistles, or at least in some Latin Writers, at the time when that Preface was made. Upon this account the Author, who possibly had not the occasion of consulting the Creek Copies, supposed, that if that Passage was not extant in any Latin Copy, the Translators were to be blamed. 'Tis observable that the Addition is not in most of the old Copies of *S. Jerome's* Bible, to which neverthe-
less

less the Preface is prefixt, as I have observed in two Copies, one whereof is in the Royal Library, and the other in that belonging to Mr. Colbert. How incongruous is it, to see a Preface at the beginning of the Canonical Epistles, where S. *Jerome* complains of the unfaithfulness of the ancient Latin Translators, who have omitted in the First Epistle of S. *John*, Chap. 1. a whole Verse which he restores to the Greek; and yet, if one turn to the place of S. *John*'s Epistle in the very same Copy, the passage is not to be found there. There can be no other reason given, in my opinion, of this incoherency, but this, that the Transcribers who writ out the Preface, made use of such Latin Copies, in which that Verse was not extant; because neither S. *Jerome*, nor the antient Latin Version had any thing of it. If that Father had been the Author of the Preface, and of the Addition inserted in S. *John*'s Epistle, that Addition would have been extant in all S. *Jerome*'s Latin Bibles. This diversity of Copies is in my judgment an evident proof, that he did not compose that Preface to prefix it to the Canonical Epistles.

And that which makes it further manifest, that S. *Jerome* was not the true Author either of the Preface or Addition, is, that that Addition is placed in the Margin of most of the antient Copies, in the Body of which it is not extant. It was no less than surprising, (g) that the pretended S. *Jerome* should in his Preface, commend his new Edition of the Canonical Epistles, upon the account of the change he had made, especially in the First of S. *John*, whilst there was nothing of such change or amendment to be seen therein. Upon which account the Transcribers, or they to whom the Copies did belong, thought fit to regulate the Text according to the Preface, by supplying, in the Margin, the Verse concerning *the Witness of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*; which, before that time was extant in some Ecclesiastical Authors. But since it was a matter of difficulty for those who placed that Addition in the Margin of their Copies, to observe a general and perfect uniformity of words, it so fell out, that the Expressions in the various Copies did likewise vary. This diversity does evidently prove that S. *Jerome* could not be the Author of the Addition in controversy, but that it was done by those who had a mind to adjust the Text in S. *James* to the Preface. I shall here give some Examples of that Regulation, of the manner how it was added to most of the old Latin Copies of S. *Jerome*'s Bible.

(g) *Quantum à nostrà aliorum distet editio, lectoris judicio relinquo.* Hier. Prolog. in VII. Epist. Can.

Cod. MSS. In that Copy of the Royal Library that is marked 3584. in the
Bibl. Reg. Margin over against these words, *Tres sunt qui testimonium dant*, i. e. *There are three which bear witness*; there are these other words added, *In celo, Pater, Verbum, & Spiritus: & tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terrâ, & hi tres unum sunt.* i. e. *In Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit: and there are three which bear witness on earth, and these three are one.* The writing of the Addition appears to be no less ancient than that of the Text. The like Addition is to be seen

Cod. MSS. in a Copy that is in Mr. Colbert's Library, that is marked 158. where
Bibl. Colb. in the Margin, over against these words, *Tres sunt qui testimonium dant*, these are added, *In celo, Pater, Verbum, & Spiritus, & tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terrâ, sanguis, aqua, & caro.* And to make the Text and Addition agree the better, there are some of the words of the Text amended or put out. There is nothing of this Addition to be read in the three ancient Copies of the Library belonging to the

Cod. MSS. Benedictines of the Abby of S. Germans, only it is placed in the Mar-
Bibl. Ben. gin of one of these Copies, and the Addition is as old therein as the
S. Germ. Text it self.
Parif.

'Tis true, that it is extant in a Copy written eight Hundred Years ago, in the time of Lotharius II. But it is strangely disguised in
Cod. MSS. that place; in that Copy the Reading was formerly thus, *Sunt tres*
Bibl. Ben. *qui testimonium dant*, (the words in terrâ being interlined) *spiritus,*
S. Germ. *aqua, & sanguis; & tres unum sunt: & tres sunt qui de celo testifican-*
tur, pater, verbum, & spiritus, & tres unum sunt. But some time after-
wards, the words (*de celo testificantur*, i. e. *bear witness of Heaven*) were defaced, to make room for these, *testimonium dicunt in celo,* i. e. *bear witness in Heaven.*

All which different Alterations are evident proofs that there was nothing of that Addition in the first Copies which were published of S. Jerome's Bible; for which reason it is not to be found in a certain Version of the French Church, which is at least a Thousand Years old, and which was published by F. Mabillon a Benedictine Monk, and the first who in effect seems to have inserted that Passage in his Works, is Victor Bishop of Vite, who lived a Hundred Years after S. Jerome. Take his own words in his Second Book of the Persecution of the Vandals: *Et ut adhuc luce clarius unius Divi-*
Victor Vi- *nitatis esse cum Patre & Filio Spiritum Sanctum doceamus, Joannis*
tenfis, l. 2. *Evangelistæ testimonio comprobatur. Ait namque, tres sunt qui testimo-*
persec. *nium probibent in celo, Pater, Verbum, & Spiritus Sanctus, & hi tres*
Afric. *unum sunt: i. e. And further, to shew, that 'tis most evident, that the*
Provinc. *Holy Ghost is the same God with the Father and the Son, the testimo-*
edit. Basil. *ny of S. John the Evangelist is sufficient; for he says, that there are*
ann. *three that bear witness in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy*
1539. *Ghost,*

Ghost, and these three are one. St. Fulgence a little after did also quote him. But I refer that to a larger Discourse in the II. Book of this Work, where I shall particularly treat of the Versions of the New Testament.

I know that a great many Men of Learning have alledged that St. Cyprian, (who lived a long time before St. Jerom,) had quoted that passage in his Books. The Bishop of Oxford brought the testimony of St. Cyprian, (h) to justify St. Jerom's Preface, and at the same time, to shew, that that Father could not be accused of any unfair dealing, because he only re-established the Ancient Latin Edition in its first purity. Father Amelote, who belongs to the Chappel, freely declares that the same passage is wanting in St. Athanasius, St. Cyril, St. Gregory, St. Nazianzen, St. Chrysostom, Didymus, and (as to the Fathers of the Latine Church,) in St. Augustin, St. Leon, Beda, and in divers others; and yet does assure us, that it is extant in a Treatise of St. Cyprian concerning the Unity of the Church.

But can we imagine, if St. Cyprian had had it in his Copy of the New Testament, that St. Augustin would not have made use of it against the Arians of his time? The truth is, after I had strictly examined that passage of St. Cyprian, which is the matter in Question, I fully persuaded my self that that Pious Prelate had only made mention of these words, & *hi tres unum sunt*, i.e. *and these three are one*, about which there is no contest, and that from thence he would prove, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to be one and the same. It is written (says he) of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, *and these three are one*. He applies to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, what we read in all the Greek and Latine Copies concerning the testimony of the Spirit, the Water and the Blood, of which it is said, that they are one, & *hi tres unum sunt*, which differs very much from an express quotation of those Words, as if they were in the Text it self.

And that there may be no doubt left, but that this is St. Cyprian's true sense of the words, it is but consulting the Learned Facundus, who was of the same African Church, and gives their explication at large, evincing the mystery of the Trinity from them, after his example. He does suppose through his whole Discourse, that in St. John's Epistle, Chap. v. there are only these words extant, *Tres sunt qui testificantiur in terra, spiritus, aqua & sanguis*. i.e. *There are three which bear* Facund.
prodefens.
Tri. capit.
l. 1. c. 3.

(h) Cui gravissima calumniae de D. Hieronymo falsario & S. Scripturarum interpolatore amolenda sufficere poterit Cyprianum citasse non modò ante Hieronymi tempora, sed Ari ipsius & litem de dogmate illo quod adeò displicet Socino de trino & uno Deo scriptorem. Joann. Episc. Oxon. Not. in Cyp. de unit. Eccles.

witness on earth, the Spirit, the Water and the Blood. But he adds at the same time, that they are to be understood of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. *De Patre Filio & Spiritu Sancto dicit, tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terrâ, spiritus, aqua & sanguis, & hi tres unum sunt; in spiritu significans Patrem, in aquâ Spiritum Sanctum, in sanguine vero Filium significans.* His meaning is that the three Persons are signified by the three Witnesses of the Earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood. And the more to confirm his Opinion, he adds, that St. Cyprian was of the mind, that this is proper sense of that passage in St. John. *Quod Joannis Apostoli testimonium beatus Cyprianus Carthaginiensis Antistes & Martyr, in Epistola sive libro quem de * Trinitate scripsit, de Patre, Filio & Spiritu Sancto dictum intelligit.*

If the Bishop of Oxford had compared the words of *Facundus* with those of St. Cyprian, he had not brought such weak Arguments against *Erasmus* and *Socinus*, in the defence of St. *Jerome*, who stood in no need of that service, seeing he was not the Author of the Preface to the Canonical Epistles, nor of the Addition inserted in St. John's Epistle, Chap. v. *Victor* the Bishop, not having considered the matter so narrowly, brings in the *Witness of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, as if St. John had expressly made mention of them, whereas St. Cyprian and *Facundus*, bring it only as an explication of the Witness of the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood. The same thing hapned to those who caused to Print St. *Athanasius's* Works, with a Table of the passages of Holy Scripture, which are quoted therein. They have set down at large there, the seventh Verse of the fifth Chapter of the first Epistle of St. John, as if that Holy Man had quoted that place after that manner. Yet in his dispute against the *Arians*, he only made use of these words, *ὁ θεὸς τὸ ἐν εἰς*, and these Three are One, and applied the same to the Trinity.

I make no question but that this Explication of St. *Athanasius*, was the occasion that some Greek Scoliastes placed in the Margin of their Copies the formentioned Note, which afterwards was put in the Text. And that is more probable than what *Erasmus* thought concerning this matter, who was of opinion, that the Greek Copies, which make mention of the *Witness of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, were more Correct than the Latin Copies. If he had only spoken of such Greek Copies as were written by those of the Latin Church, and which served for their use, what he alledged, would be the more credible. But that the Greeks, after their reunion with the Latin Church, made their Copies of the New Testament more Correct than the Latin, is against all appearance of Truth. On the contrary, 'tis manifest that the Copies that have been since that time, make no mention of that Testimony.

The

The Observation that *Fromondus*, a Divine of *Louvain*, made on that place of *St. John*, after some other Commentators is without any ground. He acknowledged that *St. Augustin*, and many other Latin Fathers, had not that passage of *St. John* extant in their Copies; but at the same time he adds, (i) that the *Arians* had taken away the same out of many Copies, and that the Latin Version which *St. Augustin*, and those other Fathers made use of, was compiled out of those Books that were corrupted by the *Arians*. This opinion is most absurd, and can have no other ground, but the Preface that is fathered on *St. Jerome*. With what reason could they accuse the *Arians* of changing the Greek Copies of the New Testament in that place, seeing *St. Cyprian*, who lived before *Arius's* name was known in the World, had no such Verse in his Copy? Besides, the same alteration must of necessity have reached all other Churches: for neither the *Syrians* of any Sect whatsoever, nor any other Eastern Church have it in their Editions of the New Testament.

And I cannot imagin what advantage the *Antitrinitarians* can get against the Catholicks, upon this ground, that that passage is not found in the most part of the Greek Manuscripts, nor those others of the Eastern Church, nor yet in the old Latin Copies. For the most learned Interpreters of the New Testament do not Expound it with reference to the Trinity. Such ancient Ecclesiastical Writers as have applyed it to that Mystery, followed the Custom of that time, which was to give the Scripture such a Theological sense, as was accommodated to the Faith then received in the Church. Now whether that Verse be Read in the I. Epistle of *St. John*, as all those of the Greek and Latin Churches do at this day, or it be not Read; yet the Doctrine of the Trinity may always be very well proved from that place, against those who deny that Mystery; because the Fathers from the first Ages of the Church, have applyed the Witness of the *Spirit, of the Water, and of the Blood*, to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. They have proved, by the Unity of those Witnesses, that the three Persons of the Trinity are one.

It is therefore to no purpose to dispute about the Addition or Omission of a passage, which by it self, does not clearly establish, but only suppose a Trinity of Persons, according to the opinion of the most Ancient Divines of the Church. I do not believe, that

(i) *Videntur Græci Ariam ex multis codicibus Græcis primum erasisse, & deinde translationem Latinam, quâ S. Augustinus & multi Patres usi sunt, ex codice Græco mutilato factam fuisse.* From Comm. in Epist. 1. Joann. c. 3.

the most of the Modern Divines had any intention of favouring *Arianism*, when they observed that that place shews that the Witnesses are *One*. *Those three* (says Father *Amelote*) are *one* in their Testimony, the *Father* gave a Testimony to *Jesus Christ*, in *Jordan*. The *Word*, by his Words and Actions, the *Holy Ghost*, in the form of a Dove, and by his miraculous Gifts.

Herman.
Cingal.
Script.
S. Trinit.
Revelat.
p. 105.

I cannot after all, in any wise conceive for what use or purpose *Sandius* has quoted, upon the credit of others, so many different Editions of the New Testament, in which the Verse in question is not to be found. Seeing the most part of those Greek Editions were taken from one another, and but very few of them from Manuscript Copies, their great number signifies nothing. I do not think, for example, that that of *Strasburg*, An. 1524. or that of *Simon de Colines*, at *Paris*, An. 1534. were compiled by the help of Manuscripts. *Wolffius*, who published that of *Strasburg*, makes no mention of it in his Preface. On the contrary, he declares, that he only Reprinted in a new Letter, and another Volume, what had been Printed before that time. *Simon de Colines* made no Preface to his Greek Edition; which makes me think he compiled it according to the best of his skill, by Editions that were extant before. *Erasmus* is one of the first, who gave occasion for the omission of that Verse, in those Greek Editions of the New Testament that came after his own, which was An. 1516. And he published another, An. 1519. where that Verse is also wanting. Those Editions, on the contrary, which came out after the Complute or *Alcala*, An. 1515. have all that Verse. Hence it is, that it is extant in *Robert Stephen's* Fair Edition, and in the most part of the other Editions. The Manuscript, and not the Printed Copies, are to be heeded, unless these be taken from the Manuscripts, such as the Edition of *Alcala*, and that of *Erasmus*.

Nor is there any account to be made of the great number of Editions, of *Luther's Dutch* Version, that *Sandius* brings against the *Lutherans*. For they are only repetitions of the first, in which *Luther* had followed the Edition of *Erasmus*, or some other, there being at that time many, even in *Holland*, which had been published without that Verse. I do not think that that Patriarch of the North was well Read in the Greek Manuscript Copies, though the most part of his followers do justify him in this manner, when it is objected to them, that their Master has corrupted the Scripture, by leaving out a passage of the New Testament, that asserts the Mystery of the Trinity. He might (say they) very well omit that Verse, with the Greek Edition of the *Haguenau*, An. 1521.

Rauibius,

Raithius, in answer to this objection, (*k*) says, that *Luther* did think fit to put that only in his Version, which was constantly, and by all agreed on, and that consequently, he might omit a Verse about which some doubts had arisen, and which was not in *Aldus's* Edition, which he made use of, as it is believed. Besides, he was persuaded that there were other passages, which afforded a lasting Foundation for the belief of the Trinity.

This is a plausible Reason, because *Luther* took upon him the Translating a *Greek* Copy into his own Language. But if the Master was to be justified in this respect, I see no reason why his Disciples should alter his Version in that place, and that they should commend to the people, for the true word of God, a thing they believed to be doubtful. It might possibly have been more to the purpose, according to their principle, to preserve their ancient *Dutch* Version, and content themselves with placing that Verse in the Margin, by way of remark. On the contrary they bring it at this day against the *Antitrinitarians*, as a strong proof of the Mystery of the Trinity; little thinking, that they give them, by that means, the fairest occasion imaginable of Triumphant over them. It is the bare Authority of the Church that does at present oblige us to receive that passage as Authentick. The *Greeks*, though otherwise disaffected to the Latin Church, fully agree with them in this matter.

There is a greater Uniformity amongst the *Calvinists*, in their Versions of the New Testament, than amongst the *Lutherans*. For though they pretend, as well as they to Translate the Original *Greek*, yet they have retained that Verse in all their Translations. *Beza*, who openly declares that it is not to be found in the most part of the Ancients, yet says withal, (*l*) that it ought to be kept in the Text, whereof it is a part. *Diodati*, who has likewise retained it in his *Italian* Version, is of Opinion, (*m*) that the Unity mentioned in that place, is as well an Unity of Nature, as an Unity or Consent of Testimony. But *Calvin* is much more reserved on this occasion, according to his wonted precaution, never to make us weak Arguments against the *Antitrinitarians*. That Ex-

(*k*) *Quid mirum, si Lutherus qui indubitata tantum scribere decreverat, hæc non extra aleam dubitationis posita prætermisit, aut quod in Aldi Manutii Venetæ editione quâ usus creditur non occurrit, etiam non vertit, cum præsertim Trinitatem etiam sublato hoc loco nihilominus firmissimis documentis aliis stabiliri intelligeret.* Raith. Vind. Vers. Germ. Luth.

(*l*) *Hic versiculus omnino mihi retinendus videtur.* Beza Not. in 1 Joann. c. 5. v. 7.

(*m*) *Così in essenza come in unione è consentimento di questa testimonianza.* Diod. Not. in 1 Joann. c. 5.

Calv. Comm. 1st Epist. 1. Joann. c. 5. v. 7. *pression, (says he) Three are One does not denote the Essence, but the Consent.*

He perceived, no less than *Luther*, that that passage was not in the most Copies, and was very sensible that it would be a matter of no small difficulty to reconcile the words of *St. Jerome*, (in that Preface which is alledged to be his) to the ancient *Greek Books*. He durst not deal freely in the matter, lest he should have offended his weak Brethren. I shall here set down his own words, that the World may see how this Man carried himself, when upon any occasion he was obliged to Criticize on such places of Scripture as appeared to him doubtful. *All this has been omitted by some. Which St. Jerome thought, did proceed rather from malice, than ignorance or inadvertency, and which was not done but by those of the Latin Church. But forasmuch as the Greek Books do not agree amongst themselves, it is not easie for me to be positive about the matter. Nevertheless, because the Text runs very well with that Addition, and, as I observe, it is extant in the best, and most Correct Copies, for my part I am very willing to admit of it.*

CHAP. XIX.

Of the Book of the Revelation. What was the Belief of the Ancients concerning it. The Hereticks that did reject it. Their Reasons; which are Examined. There have been also Learned Catholicks of ancient time, who have ascribed it to Cerinthus. The Opinion of these latter times about the same Book.

Hierom. Epist. ad Dard. **W**Hat remains of the Books of the New Testament, to be examined, is the Apocalyps, which *St. Jerom* makes mention of, in one of his Epistles, as being a Book that was not commonly received in the *Greek Churches* of his time. But if *Tertullian's Maxim* have any weight with us, *illud verum quod primum*, i.e. *That is most likely to be true that was first*. We will prefer the Universal Opinion of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, to that of some *Greek Churches*, of later times. It is upon this ground, that *Grotius* gives his Judgment

ment of this Book, when he says, that (a) *St. Justin*, *St. Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Clement of Alexandria*, *Origen*, *St. Cyprian*, who may be believed in this matter, have by one common consent, avouched *St. John* as the Author of that Book. *Flaccus Illyricus* had affirmed the same thing before, assuring us (b) that it is very reasonable we should refer this to the Fathers, who lived near the time of the Author.

And therefore *Baronius* has judiciously observed, that what *St. Jerom* does alledge, concerning the Opinion of the *Greek Churches* about the *Apocalyps*, cannot be altogether true, seeing that *St. Epiphanius* who lived at that time, and who was not much older than he, defended the Authority of that Book, against the *Alogian*, and *Theodotian* Hereticks. That Cardinal does nevertheless declare, that he cannot in this respect blame *St. Jerom*, for having unhappily traduced the *Greek Churches* in his time. He believed that he meant *St. Basil*, *Amphilochius*, the two *Gregories of Nazianzen* and *Nysse*, and the Council of *Laodicea*, who did not reckon the *Apocalyps* amongst the Canonical Books of Scripture. He distinguishes betwixt those Fathers, and the *Alogians* and *Theodotians*, upon this account, that the former had not impeached the Authority of that Book, with an avowed obstinacy as the latter had done. And even *St. Epiphanius* is not so much against *St. Jerom*, but that he insinuates, that the *Alogians*; (who rejected in general all that is extant of *St. John's* Writings,) would have been in some respect excusable, if they had rejected nothing but the Revelation, which is an obscure and unintelligible Book. Baron. ann. Ch. 97. n. 6.

The *Alogians* pretended that the *Apocalyps*, and the rest of *St. John's* Writings, were composed by the Heretick *Cerintus*. Which they endeavoured to shew, by the agreement that the Doctrine which *Cerintus* professed, had to that contained in the Books of that Apostle, and especially in his Revelation. Baron. ibid. n. 7.

They likewise drew up particular objections against this latter

(a) *Apostoli Joannis esse hunc librum credidere illi quibus merito creditur, Justinus contra Tryphonem, Irenæus, Tertullianus adversus Marcionem, & alii multi in locis, quibus consentiunt Clemens Alexandrinus, Origenes, Cyprianus, & post eos alii multi. Grot. Annot. in tit. Apoc.*

(b) *Si iis habeatur fides Patribus, qui propius ad hoc accesserunt seculum, uti certe æquissimum est, quales sunt Justinus, Tertullianus, Irenæus, Apollonius, Theophilus Antiochenus — affirmari poterit eam ut Joannis Apostoli illo primo seculo habitam. Cur enim tam certò Joannis Apostoli esse confirmarent, si dubias de eà extitisse sententias antecessorum cognovissent. Flac. Illyr. arg. in Apoc.*

Epiph.
ibid.

I Cor. xv.
32.

Work. (c) *Of what use (say they) can the Revelation of St. John be to us, when he tells us of seven Angels, and of seven Trumpets?* St. Epiphanius gives them this answer, that God was pleased to reveal to his servant *John*, what was most mysterious in the Law and the Prophets, to the end that he might treat of them in a spiritual and intelligible manner. And seeing those Hereticks were so bold as to ridicule what is said of the seven Trumpets, he charges them, upon that account, either of malice or ignorance, from the words of St. Paul, who has also made mention of those Trumpets, in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, where he says, *The trumpet shall sound, and at the sound of this trumpet the dead shall rise.*

Some of the *Alogians*, to disparage the Authority of the *Apocalyp*s, another argument; make use of these words, for in Chap. ii. ver. 18. of the Book, *To the Angel of the Church of Thyatira, write:* (d) *There was not at that time (say they,) any Christian Church in Thyatira.* How could St. *John* write to a Church, which had no being? St. Epiphanius being of the same opinion with the *Alogians*, that there was no Church in that place, at that time, that he may answer their objection, is forced to have recourse to the Spirit of Prophecy. He thinks that St. *John*, who was inspired by God, foresaw what should happen in process of time. And therefore he gives us the most exact account that he can, of the City of *Thyatira*, about the time when the *Phrygian* Hereticks did bear sway there. He shews how it afterwards became an Orthodox and most famous Church. (e) *The design of the Holy Ghost (says he) was to reveal, in that place of the Apocalyp*s, that that Church should fall from the Truth, after the time of St. *John*, and the other Apostles. Which happened, as Epiphanius himself does tell us, ninety three years after the Ascension of our Lord and Saviour.

Seeing this answer of St. Epiphanius does agree with the Opinion of the *Alogians*, that there was no Christian Church in effect, in the City of *Thyatira*, at that time, Socinus (f) could by no means admit of it, being persuaded that the Text of the *Apocalyp*s does evi-

(c) Τί με ἀρελεῖ ἡ ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου λέγουσά μοι ὅτι ἐπὶ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐπὶ σαλπίγγων. Alog. apud Epiph. Har. 51. n. 32.

(d) Οὐκ ἔστι ἐκτὶ ἐκκλησία Χριστιανῶν ἐν Θυατείρῃ· πῶς ἔν ἐγγράφε τῇ καὶ ἔση. Alog. apud Epiph. ibid. n. 33.

(e) Ἐσπίδασι τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα ἀποκάλυψαι ἡμῖν πῶς ἔμμελλε παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐκκλησία μετὰ τὸν χρόνον τῆς ἀποστόλων εἶναι τε Ἰωάννου καὶ τῆς καθεστῆς· ὅς ἐστι καὶ ἔστι καὶ οὐκ ἔστι ἀνάμνησιν ὅτι ἐνεγένετο καὶ τοιοῦτον ἔστι. Epiph. ibid.

(f) Mihi quidem, ut verum fatear, responsio ista non admodum probatur, cum propter alia, tum propter id quod nimis aperte ex ipsa historia Apocalypsis constare videtur, jam istam Ecclesiam Thyatirensensem reverà exstitisse. Soc. Lect. Sac. p. 306.

dently

dently shew that there was a Church therein. He believed that there were several Cities of that name. But for all that, he does not prove against the *Alogians*, that there was a Church in *Thyatira*. When he brings the plain words of the Apocalyps against them, he gets the thing in Question for an Answer, seeing those Sectaries endeavoured by that means to lessen the Authority of that Book. It is probable that at that time, when St. *Epiphanius* lived, there was no Catalogue of the Bishops of that Church, nor of other publick Records, that might make it manifest, that there had been a Church founded in that City, from the times of the Apostles. And therefore *Grotius* does give a more judicious answer, *That the truth is, there was not any Church of the Gentiles in Thyatira, when St. John writ the Revelation, but there was a Church of the Jews, as also, there was the like at Thessalonica before St. Paul Preached there.* Grot.
Annot. ad
c. 2. Apoc.
v. 18.

The *Alogians* do also cavil about that which is mentioned in the same Book, Chap. ix. ver. 14. Of the four Angels which were bound on the River Euphrates. But St. *Epiphanius* does in this charge them with ignorance, because those Angels, who were placed on the River Euphrates, do signifie, according to his Opinion, so many Nations that were situated on that River, viz. the *Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes and Persians*. And adds, that seeing Nations are subject to Angels, those words of the Apocalyps, *Loose the four Angels which are upon Euphrates*, make very good sense, St. *John* intending to shew thereby, that those Nations being loosed should make War against another People. I shall not here examin whether or no, the Exposition given by St. *Epiphanius* be agreeable to the Text, but content myself to observe in general, that seeing that Book, is a Prophecie, and no History, the Author was to write as Prophets were wont to do, in a Figurative Stile. And so the *Alogians* were inexcusable for their prejudice against this Book, upon the account of the expressions; (which to them appeared very strange) unless they imagined that there was no such thing as a Prophecie in the New Testament. Epiph.
ibid.

Cajus, an Orthodox Writer, who lived at Rome, under Pope *Zephyrin*, and of whom we have spoken before, did also believe that *Cerintus* was the Author of the Revelation of St. *John*. He treated that Heretick with derision, (g) who, *As if he had been a great Apostle, writ Revelations which he pretended to have received from Angels, and in which, he assured us, that after the Resurrection, Jesus Christ shall reign upon the Earth. He allowed the space of a thousand years to*

(g) Κλέωνος ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου οἷς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου γυγασμῶν, τετρατολῶν ἡμῶν ὡς δὲ ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ διδεδυγμένος ἰδούμενος ἐπεισάγει λόγων μὲν τῶν ἀναστάντων ἐπὶ τὸ βασιλεῖον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. *Caj. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 3. c. 28.*

this Carnal Kingdom, which was to be accompanied with all sorts of pleasures. For this cause he calls *Cerintbus* an Enemy to the Holy Scriptures, and spoke in this manner of the Apocalyps, which he thought, was written by him, and not by St. *John*.

Dion.
Alex.
apud Euf.
bid.

Denis, Bishop of *Alexandria*, who vigorously defended the Authority of this Book, did likewise observe that some Authors did ascribe the Apocalyps to *Cerintbus*, who (according to their Opinion) had prefixed St. *John's* Name to the Book, to give Authority to his Babbling about the Carnal Reign of *Jesus Christ* on the Earth. Seeing this Opinion that maintained a Chimerical Dominion of a thousand years was spread in the Church, this Learned Bishop writ two Treatises against it, Entituled * *Of the Promises*. Wherein he takes to task (h) *Nepos*, a certain Bishop of *Egypt*, who Expounded the Promises, which God in Scripture has made to Mankind, in a sense that speaks the Expofitor to have been more *Jew* than Christian; dreaming of a Carnal Kingdom upon the Earth, that should continue for the space of a thousand years, during which time all manner of Pleasures should be enjoyed.

* Περὶ
ἐπαγγελίας
αὐτῶν.

† * Εὐαγγέλιον
ἀλλήλων
ἐν ᾧ
λέ-
γεται.

Upon this subject *Nepos* did publish a Book, Entituled † *A Refutation of Allegorists*, laughing at such Catholicks as Expounded Allegorically that place in the Apocalyps, that makes mention of the Reign of a thousand years. Which Work made a great impresson on the minds of those who read it, because the Author, who had carefully applied himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures, had acquired a very great Reputation. Besides, his Reasons appeared to be the more probable, because they were founded on the Literal Sense of Scripture, whereas the contrary Opinion was grounded upon Allegories only, from which nothing can be concluded. *Denis* does likewise (i) declare the honorable esteem he had for the Memory of his then deceased Adversary, whose Faith and Parts he commends. But withal, he adds, that the love which he bore to the Truth above all other things, was a sufficient motive that engaged him to write against that Work, that was so much admired in *Egypt*, that many preferred the Doctrine therein contained, to the Gospels and the Epistles of the Apostles: they were so much puffed up with the Idea of the thousand years Reign on the Earth. The matter was brought to that pass, that *Nepos* his Followers, chused rather to make a

(h) Νέπος ἐπίσκοπος ὅς ἐστι καὶ Ἀιγυπτίον, ἐνδεκνότερον τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τοῖς ἀγίοις ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς ἐπαγγελίας ἀποδείξαι διδόντων, καὶ πᾶσι χαλιδάσαι ἐν αὐτῇ σωματικῇ ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ αὐτοῦ ἐσχάτῃ ἐσσηνίσθη. Euseb. l. 7. Hist. Eccl. c. 24.

(i) Ἐν ἄλλοις μὲν πολλοῖς ἀποδείχοντι καὶ ἀγαπῶν Νέποντα, τῆς τιμῆς καὶ τῆς φιλοπορίας καὶ τῆς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς διατελέτης. Euseb. ibid.

Schism, than to abdicate their Opinion. But *Denis*, afterwards, in a publick Dispute, having discovered the falsity thereof, brought them to renounce their error.

It is a very judicious course that that Learned Bishop takes, as to his manner of defending the Authority of the Apocalyps against those who rejected it as a supposititious Book, and done by *Cerintbus*. He appeared to be in no wise byassed by any preoccupation, as to his own Opinion; nor guilty of concealing the Reasons of his Adversaries. And therefore he freely declares, that (k) some Ecclesiastical Writers who lived in his time, had opposed that Book with all their might, refusing it with a nice and resolute eagerness, alledging that it was written without Sense, and without Reason. They further assured us that the Title of that Work was forged by *Cerintbus*, and that the Title Apocalyps, or Revelation, could not be attributed to a Book, which in their Opinion was stuffed with things that manifest a profound ignorance.

Notwithstanding all those Objections, *Denis* avows that he cannot reject it, as perceiving that it was approved by the most part of his Brethren: and to the Reasons on the other side, he replies, that there is a sublime and hidden Sense in the Expressions of that Author; for which he is resolved to have an high veneration, though he does not comprehend it, being persuaded, that Faith, and not his own knowledge, ought to be the Rule in that case. (l) *I do not* (saith he) *condemn that which I cannot understand; on the contrary I admire it, because I cannot comprehend it.* Which nevertheless does not hinder him from examining all the parts of the Books particularly; and he shews, (m) *That it is impossible to Expound it according to the Letter, or Sense which the words at first view seem to warrant.* He further declares that it was composed by a Man, called *John*, who was inspired by God. But he does not think, that that *John* was an Apostle; and grounds his Opinion on this, that the Apostle St. *John* did put his Name to none of his Works, and that he never speaks of himself. On the contrary, the Author of the Revelation does name himself at the beginning, and frequently in the Body of his Work; for example, in the Letter he writes to the seven Churches of *Asia*,

(k) Τινες μὲν ἔν τῳ περὶ ἡμῶν ἡθάρτου καὶ ἀντοχάσας πάντα τὰ βιβλία καὶ ἔχον κεφάλαιον διδόνοντες, ἀρῶσιν τε καὶ ἀσυλλήγιστον ἀπορρίνοντες· ἰδὲ δευτέρῳ τῷ ἐπιγεφυρω. Ἰωάννῃ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι λέγεσθαι ἀλλ' ὅτι ἀποκελευ-θῆναι τῷ σφοδρῶ καὶ πάχει καυχουμένῳ τῷ τῆς ἀγνοίας παραπτώματι· Dion. Alex. apud Euseb. ibid. cap. 25.

(l) Ὅσα ἀποδοκιμάζω ταῦτα ἀμὲν συννώσκει· θαυμάζω δὲ μάλλον ὅτι μὴ καὶ εἶδον. Ibid.

(m) Ἀνύστατον δὲ ἀποκελευ-θῆναι καὶ τῷ περὶ χερσὶν νοεῖας διάνοιαν. Ibid.

he begins with these words, *John to the seven Churches which are in Asia*. But *St. John* does not so much as put his name to his Catholick Epistle, in his entrance upon the matter. Neither is it seen at the beginning of his two other Epistles that are very short, and pass under his name.

This difference of *Stile* makes *Denis* the Bishop of *Alexandria* to conclude, that the Revelation was not written by *St. John*; and he affirms at the same time, that it is uncertain who that *John* was. He proves nevertheless, that it is in no wise likely that he was *John*, Sir-named *Mark*, made mention of in the Acts of the Apostles, and who was Companion to *Paul* and *Barnabas* in their Travels; because he did not follow them into *Asia*. And therefore he judges that he was one of those who lived at *Ephesus*, where there were two Sepulchres with that name. Once he has recourse to the difference of *Stile*, from which he pretends to prove, that the Apostle *St. John*, who writ the Gospel, and one Epistle, cannot be the Author of the Apocalyps. According to his Opinion, the same things, and the same expressions are found in the former Books. The Revelation, on the contrary, is quite different from both.

Thus I have considered at large, the judgment of *Denis*, the Bishop of *Alexandria*, upon the Apocalyps, (upon which *Eusebius* has more fully Paraphrased) because it contains, in a few words, all that can be said upon this subject. He informs us at the same time, that the ancient Doctors of the Church made a great account of Tradition, upon such an emergent occasion as required their Judgment, whether a Book was Canonical or no. We also see, that in such junctures they observed the Rules that are commonly received amongst Critics. For the Bishop, according to the rigorous Laws of Criticism, does examine the Diction, or *Stile* of the Apocalyps, (n) Which (says he) is in no wise good Greek, being full of Barbarisms, and Solecisms.

The distinction he uses concerning two *Johns*, who lived in *Ephesus*, is grounded upon the Testimony of *Papias*, who was Contemporary with the Disciples of the Apostles. *Eusebius*, who inserted that Testimony in his History, does add, that he is positive in it: For (o) if the Apostle *St. John* is not the true Author of the Apocalyps, which bears the name of *John*, it is probable that it was written by that second *John*. Nevertheless the most ancient Fathers,

(n) Διαλεκτον μήτοι καὶ γλώσσαν ἐκ ἀκρίβειας ἐκκλησίᾳ αὐτῶν βλήστω· ἀλλ' ἰδιώμασι καὶ βαρβαρίαις γερόντων, καὶ περὶ πολλοὶ κίζοντα. Dionis. apud Euseb. ibid.

(o) Ἐικός δ' τὸν δευτέρου εἰ μὴ τις ἔδιδται τὸν πρῶτον τῷ ἐπ' ὀνόματι τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ. Euseb.

viz. *Iustin*, and *Irenæus* made no account of this distinction, nor difference of *Stile*, on which *Denis* so much insists upon.

Nor can there be any thing concluded from the Title of the Apocalyp, that in the most of *Greek Copies*, whether Manuscript or Printed, there is the name of * *John the Divine*, and not of the Apostle *St. John* set therein. Those who annexed that Title meant only to describe *St. John the Evangelist*, whom the *Greek Fathers* do call the *Divine*, by way of Excellency, to distinguish him from other Evangelists. * Ἰωάννης ὁ Θεολόγος

All the *Eastern Churches* at this day, read that Book under the name of the Apostle *St. John*. It is true, that it is not so in the ancient *Syriack Copies*, because it was not in the *Greek one*, from which those were taken. It is ascribed to *St. John*, in the *Syriack Edition* of the *English Polyglott Bible*: and also in the *Arabick Printed* in the same Polyglott, it bears the name of *John the Apostle, Evangelist*; and lastly in the *Arabick* published by *Erpanius*, that of *John the Evangelist*. Not that I believe such Titles, (which are but late,) to be of any great Authority. I produce them only to shew the Universal consent of the Churches, as well that of the East, as that of the West, concerning the Author of the Revelation.

As to what concerns such singular expressions, as are no where to be found, but in this Book; chiefly, that, where there is mention made of the Reign of Jesus Christ upon the Earth with the Saints, which shall continue for the space of a thousand years. *Illyricus* has very well observed, that since that Book (p) is written in a Prophetical *Stile*, the expressions used therein ought to be taken in a Mystical sense. In which he had apparently, as to his Judgment, the advantage of *Luther*, who could not avoid the reproach that was put upon him by *Bellarmin*, and some other Opponents, for not considering the Apocalyp as a Prophetical and Apostolical Work; yet his Disciples, who acknowledged all that Book to be Divine and Canonical, have endeavoured to justify him. They alledged, (q) without any regard to his ancient Preface, that he said nothing else in that, which is found in his Works, but what has been observed by some of the ancient Fathers, *viz.* that it was not generally agreed upon that *St. John* was the Author of the Apocalyp.

(p) Phrases illas mysticè ut in sermone prophetico intelligendas. Illyr. argum. in Apoc.

(q) Lutherum quod attinet, quidquid olim scripserit in veteri præfatione, in eâ sane quæ hodie in codicibus legitur nihil de Apocalypsi asserit aliud, quàm in dubio se relinquere utrum sit Joannis Apostoli, quod nonnulli ex verustioribus Patribus id insinuari sine, nihil tamen hoc ipso se prejudicare velle alii. Christ. Korthol. de Canon. Script. S. c. 18.

Conf.
Facul.
Theol.
Parif.

And *Erasmus* had likewise enough to do upon the like account with the Divines of *Paris*, who censure one of his propositions, wherein he affirmed, (r) that there had been, for a long time, some doubting about that Book, not only amongst the Hereticks, but also the Orthodox; who though they received it as Canonical, did profess they were not certain who was the Author. What *Erasmus* does affirm in this case, is not to be charged with falshood, since it is grounded upon a matter of Fact, that may be easily proved from the Writings of the ancient Doctors of the Church. Yet the *Parisian* Divines were so forward to censure him, since they persuaded themselves that he manifestly knew, by the usage of the Church, and the definitions of Councils, that the Apocalyps was published by St. *John*. The Councils on which they stood, were the three of *Carthage*, that of *Rome*, under Pope *Gelasius*, and that of *Toledo*, in which *Isidore* of *Seville*, was an Assistant. To this they joyned the Authority of St. *Denis*, called the *Aneopagite*, St. *Irenæus*, St. *Justin*, Pope *Innocent I.* St. *Augustin*, and St. *John* of *Damascus*.

Erasmus, as it should seem, ought to have answered, that notwithstanding all those Authorities, his supposition might be true, seeing he had also Orthodox Authors on his side. He might also have said, that none of those Councils stood much on the Author of the Apocalyps, but barely complied with the opinion that commonly obtained in their time, which ascribed that Book to St. *John*. But instead of that, he only returned such answers as were extravagant and impertinent. He affirms, that the World was at that time filled with Apocryphal Books bearing forged Titles, and that the most part of honest Men, were then persuaded that such sort of falsities might be debated. He afterwards inveighs against (s) *Isidore*, as being a Man of mean capacity and judgment, who had not the sense to make use of a very good Library which he had in his possession. He was (saith he) as unskilful in making Collections as *Beda*, but the latter was the more Judicious and Eloquent of the two.

This is an instance of Learning, whereof there is an ill use made. If *Isidore* and *Bede*, were justly charged by him on that account, he ought to have proved that they were much in the wrong here, in preferring the opinion of St. *Justin*, St. *Irenæus*, and the most ancient Fa-

(r) De Apocalypsi diu dubitatum est, non dico ab hæreticis, sed ab orthodoxis viris, qui scriptum tamen ut à Spiritu Sancto profectum amplectebantur, de scriptoris nomine incerti. *Erasm. decl. ad Theol. Parif.*

(s) *Isidorus Hispalensis* scripsit rudi seculo, & habuisse videtur locupletem bibliothecam, quâ potuisset rectius uti, si fuisset exactè doctus. Certè rhapsodus fuit, quemadmodum *Beda*. Quamquam *Beda* meo judicio fuit illo tum eruditior, tum eloquentior. *Erasm. declar. ad cens. Fac. Theol. Parif.*

thers,

thers, to that of some other Writers, who were not so near the first Age. The answer he made to the Divines of *Paris*, was more likely to provoke them than his first Proposition was. For he thereby plainly reproached those sage Masters, that they were conversant in no good Authors, but only Rhapsodists, and unskilful Compilers of History.

It is true, that he might not offend them, he adds at the same time, that (t) as to what concerns the Titles of the Books of Scripture, he does refer himself to the Judgment of the Universal Church, to which he does entirely submit, provided that the name of the Church Universal be not ascribed to all that is so called according to the custom and use, which has been introduced, and does obtain amongst Christians, nor to the particular Opinions of every Bishop.

If we measure the Opinion of the Unitaries by that of *Socinus*, who is one of their Heroes, they have affirmed nothing concerning the Apocalyps, but what is agreeable to good sense. This Unitary does assure us, that that Book was always, by common consent, attributed to *St. John*: *Quod Scriptum semper communi consensu tributum fuit Joanni Apostolo & Evangelistæ*. To that objection, that many Authors have doubted thereof, he makes answer, that the Judgment of *Iustin* and *Irenæus*, who lived some little time after that Book was Composed, ought to be preferred to the Opinion of those Authors. He further affirms, (u) that as to the difference of Stile, betwixt that Work, and those others which were written by *St. John*, this Objection does not oblige him to give those Reasons which prove it to be *St. John's*, since they appeared so convincing to those very persons who rejected the Book, that they were forced to acknowledge that it was written by a Man who endeavoured to persuade others, that *St. John* was the Author thereof. This last Observation seems to be more subtil than solid; a crime that is pardonable in the Unitaries, who never applied themselves to the study of the Ancient Ecclesiastical Authors.

Soc. de
Aucto.
Scrip. Sac.
c. 1. n. 2.

(t) *Prosteor me de titulis quoque credere quod credit universalis Ecclesia, cujus auctoritati facile sensum meum submitto, non hic tantum, sed in omnibus quoque ceteris, modo ne protinus Ecclesie sit quidquid quocunque modo in usum Christianorum irrepserit, aut cuiusvis Episcopo placuit.* Erasmi. ibid.

(u) *Non videtur propter parvam aliquam aut etiam magnam dissimilitudinem rationis scribendi in universum ac styli ab aliis ejusdem Joannis scriptis longe diversi generis debere aut posse dubitari quin ejus sit opus, maxime cum simul adsint tot alia testimonia & conjecturae, ut illi ipsi qui prorsus negarent ejus esse, illudque rejecerunt, coacti fuerint sateri à quopiam conscriptum fuisse qui persuadere voluerit ipsum ipsum Joannem illud conscripsisse.* Soc. ibid.

In

In the last place, the Commentaries on the Apocalyps made by the *Calvinists*, are undeniable proofs, that they do receive it into the number of Divine and Prophetical Books. Besides they would be very sorry to be without that Prophecy. *Beza* made a Discourse, Treating expressly on that Subject, by way of Preface to his Notes on that Work; where he answers the Objections which *Erasmus* had published to diminish the Authority thereof: That which he had not observed as to any other Books of the New Testament. *Calvin*, fearing that he should make himself ridiculous by his false Expositions, of a Book that is so very obscure, has taken the best side, by not publishing any Commentary on the Apocalyps. His example had no influence on his Followers; for many amongst them, did with a Prophetical tone lowly recommend to the World their own Visions upon that Book.

Besides the Books of the New Testament, which we have hitherto spoken of, and that are generally received in all the Churches, as Divine and Canonical, some others have been read in many Churches, which yet never had the same Authority. Nevertheless it has so fallen out, that those who have made Catalogues of the Sacred Books, have not always observed this distinction. For they have placed all of them in an equal rank, for Books of the Holy Scripture. There have been also some Fathers, who quoted some Books of this sort, as if they had been truly given by Divine Inspiration. But it is easie to find, even by the Writings of the Fathers, that those Works were approved by none but particular persons, whose Opinion cannot reasonably be looked upon as a Law. If I had not resolved to confine my Discourse to the Books of the New Testament, which are generally approved of in all Churches, I would have insisted at large on those other Books, but I am obliged to keep within the limits of my first purpose. I shall only observe, that in a certain Catalogue of the Books of the Bible, which is at the end of two very ancient Copies of St. Paul's Epistles, there follows (immediately after the Epistle of St. Jude) (x) the Epistle of *Barnabas*, the Revelation, or the Apocalyps of *John*, the Acts of the Apostles, the Book of the Pastor, the Acts of *Paul*, and the Revelation of *Peter*. The number also of the Verses contained in each Book of the Bible is set down in the Catalogue. And what is most of all observable, is, that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* is not comprehended therein. It is nevertheless in those two Greek

(x) *Juda Epistola, Barnabae Epistola, Joannis Revelatio, Actus Apostolorum, Pastor, Actus Pauli, Revelatio Petri.* Catal. libror. Script. S. ex Codd. MSS. Bibl. Reg. & S. Germ.

and Latin Manuscripts that are written with the same Hand, as the rest of St. Paul's Epistles; but it is placed by it self, and after the Catalogue, as if it did not belong to that Apostle. In this matter, they followed the Custom of some of the Western Churches.

CHAP. XX.

The Objections of the Jews, and other Enemies of the Christian Religion, against the Books of the New Testament. Inquiry is made if the Evangelists and Apostles made use of the Greek Version of the Septuagint, in the Passages which they quote out of the Old Testament. St. Jerom's Opinion upon the Matter. That Father declared himself for the Hebrew Text of the Jews, in opposition to that of the Septuagint.

THE Books of the New Testament having been maintained, as well in general, as in particular, it is worth the while to examine the principal Objections that are made against those Books; and at the same time against the Apostles who published them. The *Mahometans* endeavour to evince the necessity of the coming of their Prophet, from this, that seeing the Canonical Books of the *Jews* and Christians, are (according to their Opinion,) wholly corrupted, it was necessary that God should send a new Prophet upon the Earth, to teach Men the True Religion. But because they bring no solid reasons for the confirmation of what they alledge, it is to no purpose to refute them. The *Jews* and some Philosophers, who are Enemies to the Christians, have more particularly attacked the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles. They have had the impudence to charge them with Forgery, or at least with ignorance, seeing (as they object) they have quoted the Books of the Old Testament otherwise than they are in themselves. They further accuse them, of annexing to the Passages they produce, a sense that was very far from the mind of the Authors. Hereupon they draw up the strongest objections they can, against the Authority of the New Testament; which of necessity must be answered.

D

As

As to the first Objections; the *Jews* do suppose, that when a publick Record is produced for confirmation of a Matter of Fact, it is necessary, that the very words of the Record be delivered in the same manner as they are in the Original, or in faithful Copies; but (say they) the Disciples of Jesus Christ have not done that. For if the passages of the Old Testament which they have quoted in their Writings, be compared with the Original *Hebrew* Text, it will be found, that in many places they bear a quite different meaning. Whence they conclude that they are either chargeable with falshood, or that their Writings have been altered, and therefore that there is no credit to be given to them.

I answer this Objection, that it was not necessary for the Apostles, when they Preached the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to make use of the *Hebrew* Bible. On the contrary, it was more for their purpose that they should make mention of the passages of the Old Testament, so as they were read in the *Greek* Copies that were in the Hands of the most part of the World. Very few of the *Jews* at that time understood the *Hebrew* Language: whereas the *Greek* Language was spread through the whole Empire. Since therefore Jesus Christ did not send his Disciples to Preach the Gospel to a handful of Learned *Jews*, who understood the *Hebrew*, but to all the Nations of the Earth, the most part whereof spake *Greek*; they ought not only to speak in that Language, but also to report the passages of the Old Testament, after the same manner as had been written for a long time in the same Language. There was at that time, a *Greek* Version of the whole Bible, that had been made by *Jews* many Ages before, and therefore could not be suspected. And so the Evangelists and the Apostles could not justly be charged with falshood, for quoting passages otherwise than they were in the Original, since they made use of such Writings as were approved by the *Jews*, and were in use amongst them.

It is true, that if they to whom the Gospel was Preached, had understood the *Hebrew* Language, it had been better to quote the Original *Hebrew*, than the *Greek* Version of the LXX, because the Original ought always to be preferred to Translations. But as things were then, the Apostles acted most wisely, in preferring the *Greek* Copy of the Bible to the *Hebrew*, which was understood almost by none. And therefore the Church from its first beginning, had no other Scripture but the Ancient *Greek* Version; and the whole Eastern Church, (the *Syrians* being excepted) have no other at this day.

I do not think it necessary to prove, that the Apostles, in their Writings, quoted the passages of the Old Testament, according to the *Greek* of the Septuagint, and not according to the *Hebrew* Text.

It requires no extraordinary skill in both the Languages, to make one capable of judging aright in this matter. It is certain that (a) St. *Ferom* once endeavoured to persuade the World to the contrary, and to confirm his Opinion, gave instances of some places of the Old Testament that were quoted in the New, which yet are not (as he alledged) in the Original *Hebrew*. But it is easie to judge by that Learned Father's own words, that he maintained that Opinion, only to give the more Authority to a new Translation which he had made out of the *Hebrew*, because the most knowing Men of his time did strongly oppose him, as if he had designed to introduce the *Jewish* Religion into the Church.

It will appear therefore, that St. *Ferom* in that place does give an answer to his Adversaries, and endeavours as much as in him lies, to make an honorable retreat. *Emuli nostri doceant* (saith he) *assumpta aliquot testimonia quæ non sint in Hebræorum libris; & finita contentio est.* i. e. Let our Adversaries shew what testimonies are made use of, that are not in the Hebrew Books, and the Dispute is at an end. I desire no other Witness of what I alledge but himself, seeing he does establish for a general Maxim, for all the citations out of the Old Testament, that are not only made use of by the Apostles, but also by their Disciples, (b) *That when the Apostles, or Apostolical Men speak to the people, they commonly make use of such testimonies as had been published before that time amongst the Nations.* That is to say, of the Version of the Septuagint, which being written in *Greek*, was published amongst all those Nations which spoke the Language, whereas the *Hebrew* Text was only read in the *Jews* Synagogues. He proves by the same Principle, that St. *Luke*, (when he wrote the Acts of the Apostles, to declare to the Nations, the first beginnings of the Christian Religion) was to quote the Passages of the Old Testament, in the same manner as they were in the Version of the Scripture, which was before that time spread amongst the People.

There is therefore nothing so absurd as the Opinion of some Protestants, who (notwithstanding the agreement that is found betwixt the quotations of the Apostles, and the *Greek* Version of the LXX) maintain with no small Zeal, that the Apostles reported the

(a) *Crebrò dixisse me novi, Apostolos & Evangelistas ubicunque de Veteri Instrumento ponunt testimonia, si inter Hebraicum & Septuaginta nulla diversitas sit, vel suis, vel Septuaginta Interpretum verbis uti solitos. Sin autem aliter in Hebraico, aliter in Veteri Editione sensus est, Hebraicum magis quam Septuaginta Interpretes sequi.* Hieron. proœm. lib. 15. Comm. in II.

(b) *Hoc autem generaliter observandum, quod ubicunque sancti Apostoli aut Apostolici viri loquuntur ad populos, his plerunque abuti testimoniis quæ jam fuerant in gentibus divulgata.* Hieron. Qu. Heb. in Gen.

Passages of the Old Testament according to the *Hebrew Text*. They attribute that agreement to some Writers, whom they suppose to have lived after the times of the Apostles, and who (according to their Opinion) corrected the Version of the Septuagint, in all such Passages as are quoted in the New Testament. The Evangelists and the Apostles (say they) regarded the sense only, and not the Words of Scripture. If any one ask these Men the Reason why they maintain so strange a Paradox, their answer will be but this (c) that it cannot be imagined, that the spirit of the Apostles should be subject to the spirit of a little *Greek* Interpreter; and that they preferred the Streams to the Fountain, by leaving the *Hebrew Canon* to follow an uncertain Rule, especially when there was an occasion for defending the Fundamental Points of Religion against the *Jews*.

Thus some Protestants, extremely addicted to the *Hebrew*, do argue agreeable to the Ideas they have framed, about matters of Fact that are as clear as the day; instead of examining the things in themselves. Seeing *Lewis Cappel* has solidly refuted this Opinion, which has not the least appearance of truth, it will be to no purpose to spend time about it. That Learned Protestant judiciously observed, that the spirit of the Apostles is not subject to the spirit of an Interpreter; (*d*) but through a Pious condescendency, and by a true Christian Prudence, they followed the *Greek* Version which was publicly received, it being indifferent to them to quote the *Hebrew* or the *Greek* in those Passages.

Although the Apostles did prefer the *Greek* of the Septuagint, to the *Hebrew* Text, it cannot be inferred from thence, that the *Greek* Version is better than the *Hebrew* of the *Jews*, as some Authors, especially amongst the Catholics, have too easily believed. We ought to consider by what motives the Apostles were led, to give this preference to the *Greek*. Seeing they did it for no other end, but to accommodate themselves to the capacity of the People, whom they instructed, and who read the Bible in *Greek*, there can be no consequence drawn from thence, to give more Authority to the

(c) Quis credat spiritum Apostolorum spiritui Græculi interpretis se subjecisse, aut limpidos fontes canonicis Hellenistarum rivulis prætulisse; Et ubi passim de capite aliquo Religionis adversus Judeos agebatur, Apostolos, relicto Canone Hebræo, Lesbiam Græcorum regulam usurpasset. Auctor. Diss. apud Capp. in qu. de loc. parall.

(d) *Πᾶ οὐρανολόγοι* quaedam & sancta charitatisque plena prudentia Christi-
ana versionem ium recepit secuti sunt iis in locis in quibus parum aut nihil omni-
nò ad rem ipsam interest utrum textum Hebraicum, an verò Græcam ἢ Septua-
ginta versionem sequaris. Lud. Capp. qu. de loc. parall. pag. 450.

Version of the Septuagint than to the *Hebrew* Text, which they did not meddle with. In the *Hebrew* or *Chaldaick* Gospel of St. *Matthew*, the Passages of the Old Testament were quoted according to the *Hebrew* Text; because the *Jews* of *Palestine*, for whose sake it was written, read the Bible in that Language. The People, who at that time understood not the *Hebrew* Language, had Glosses on the *Hebrew* Text, written in the *Chaldee*, so that if that Evangelist had quoted the Bible in the vulgar Language, he had quoted the same according to the *Chaldaick* Glosses, and not according to the *Greek* of the Septuagint, which was not in use amongst the *Jews* of *Palestine*.

It will further appear, that the Evangelists and the Apostles did not confine themselves in their quotations to the rigor of the Letter, because that was in no wise needful for carrying on their Work. They did content themselves sometimes, with delivering the sense of the Words, which they adapted to their Discourse. A thing commonly practised; and they cannot be branded with Falshood or Imposture, who set down after this manner, such Records in their Works, as serve for proofs. A Copy of Record cannot be alledged to be false, unless the sense be changed. But this can never be found in the quotations of the Apostles, who followed a received custom, and which could be blamed by none. The same thing happened to most of the Fathers, when they quoted in the Works, the Passages of Scripture; for they made no scruple to change the Words, so long as that change was of no importance to the Sense. Which ought to be the Standard of our Judgment, about the Passages of the Old Testament, which are quoted in the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, for though they were taken from the *Greek* Version, they do not always express the very Words.

I know it may be objected, that this Version has very much degenerated from its ancient purity, and that therefore, it can no more serve as a Rule by which we may judge of the Truth of the Apostolical quotations. But what ever change has happened to this Translation, it is sufficient as it remains, to decide the matter of Fact we are now about. It is agreed by all the ancient Ecclesiastical Authors, that the Evangelists and Apostles, in the Passages they quote out of the Old Testament, were more ready to express the Sense than the Words: which is the meaning of these Words of St. *Jerom*, *In multis testimoniis* (saith he) *quæ* Hieron. Comm. in Isl. 3. c. 7. *Evangelistæ vel Apostoli de libris veteribus assumpserunt, curiosius attendendum est, non eos verborum ordinem secutos esse sed sensum.* Which
bo

he often repeats in his works, (e) *We ought to observe well* (saith he in another place) *what I have often said before, viz. That the Evangelists and Apostles did not make a Translation, word for word, and that they followed not the Version of the Septuagint, that was read in their days; but being Hebrews, and skilful in the Law, they made use of their Terms.*

That Learned Man does agree with the other Fathers, in assuring us, that the Apostles did not in their Writings, report the passages of the Old Testament word for word: But, since he was prepossessed with an opinion, in favour of the *Hebrew Text*, when he composed his Commentaries on the most part of the Prophets; he affirms, that the same Apostles made use of their own Expressions, and not those of the Septuagint. Yet 'tis easie to prove the contrary; and in this, the most part of the Protestants are very much to be blamed, for neglecting this Ancient Greek Version: For it is impossible for him to understand the Books of the New Testament well, who is not first much employed in the reading of the Septuagint. It was upon those *Seventy* Ancient Interpreters that the Apostles formed their Stile, and not upon the *Hebrew Text* of the *Jews*: I do not in the least comprehend, upon what ground St. *Ferome* could alledge, that (f) St. *Paul* being an *Hebrew* born, did, in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 2. give a paraphrase on the words of the Prophet *Isaiah*, Chap. 64. v. 4. as they are in the *Hebrew*, and had regard to nothing but the sense, according to his Custom: Yet there is nothing in that place, that can oblige us to have recourse to the *Hebrew*, rather than the Greek, for understanding the Apostles meaning.

St. *Ferome* dream'd then of nothing else, but settling his New Translation of the Scriptures upon the *Hebrew*, thereby to give satisfaction to a great number of People, who spake evil of him upon that occasion. This Spirit reigns in his Commentaries on the Old Testament, in those chiefly which are on the great Prophets.

(e) *Notare debemus illud quod plerumque admonuimus, Evangelistas & Apostolos non verbum interpretatos esse de verbo, nec Septuaginta Interpretum auctoritatem secutos, quorum editio illo jam tempore legebatur; sed quasi Hebræos & instructos in Lege absque damno sensuum suis usos esse sermonibus. Hieron. Comm. in Isai. lib. 9. cap. 29.*

(f) *Paraphrasim hujus testimonii quasi Hebræus ex Hebræis assumit Apostolus Paulus de authenticis libris in Epistola quam scribit ad Corinthios, non verbum ex verbo reddens, quod facere omnino contemnit, sed sensuum exprimens veritatem, quibus utitur ad id quod voluerit roborandum. Hieron. Comm. in II. lib. 17. cap. 64.*

He endeavours to prevent, with an assiduous Persecution, that which might be objected against from all sides; that the Church ought not to receive any other Scripture of the Old Testament, than that which was Authorised by the Apostles. Indeed this Objection which was a terrible one, must needs have made a great impression on his Spirit, and if he dare not say, that the Apostles always follow'd the *Hebrew Text*; he endeavours at least to shelter himself by assuring us, that sometimes they did not adhere either to the one or the other, because ordinarily, that which was considered by them, was the sense and not the Words.

And this he does affirm of the words of the Prophet *Jeremy*, a *Jerem.*
Voice was heard in Rama, &c. St. *Matthew* (saith he) does neither report that passage, according to the *Hebrew*, nor according to the *Greek*: *nec juxta Hebraicum, nec juxta Septuaginta sumpsit testimonium.* (g) Whence he does conclude, that the Evangelists and Apostles did not tie themselves to the Version of any Interpreter; but that being *Hebrews*, they used their own words, in expressing that which they read in the *Hebrew Text*; this general answer is what he gives almost every where.

But it may be said, and more truly, that the Apostles and Evangelists, when they instructed the People, who read the Bible in *Greek*, used, in their quotations, the expressions of the Bible, yet did not scrupulously adhere to the words, because they had the sense only in their view. To convince St. *Jerome* of this, there needs no other Passage of Scripture than that which was mentioned by himself: For which 'tis only needful to look into the *Hebrew Text*, and the *Greek* of the *Septuagint*; for, whereas it is in *Hebrew* *רמה* which that Father (together with some *Jews*) in his Version, translated in *excelsa* i. e. *on high*; the *Septuagint* who have made it a proper Name, have rendered it *ἐν 'Ραμᾷ*, in *Rama*, and St. *Matthew* followed them in his citation of the same passage: It is true, that in the other words, St. *Matthew* does rather agree with the *Hebrew* than the *Septuagint*, as St. *Jerome* has mentioned them, agreeable to the Edition of *Rome*; for it is in St. *Matthew*, *καὶ ἔκ ἡμεῶν ἀνέχοντο*, and he refused to be comforted, as it is in the *Hebrew* at this day; whereas in the *Septuagint* it is rendered, *καὶ ἡμεῶν παύσαντο*, he refused rest.

But it is probable, that the ancient reading of the *Septuagint* was agreeable to St. *Matthew*; and at this day it is extant in the

(g) Ex quo perspicuum est Evangelistas & Apostolos nequaquam ex Hebraeo interpretationem alicujus secutos, sed quasi Hebraeos ex Hebraeis quod legebant Hebraice suis sermonibus expressisse. Hieron. Comm. in Is. lib. 6. c. 31.

Copy of *Alexandria*, in the Editions of *Alde*, and *Complutum* or *Alcala*; and likewise in the *Arabian* Version, which was taken from the Septuagint. And here 'tis observable, that although that of *Rome*, is the best of all the Editions of the Septuagint, because it is the most ancient and pure of any of them, yet it is not free from errors. 'Tis to be supposed, that long before *Origen*, the *Greek* of the Septuagint was altered in some places, by some half-learned Men, whether *Jews* or *Christians*, who were far from a through knowledge of the *Hebrew* Language, but rather consulted their Dictionaries about the *Hebrew* words of the Bible; I believe that that place of *Jeremy*, is of the number of those which were altered in the Septuagint.

Amendments of that nature were then only placed in the Margin of the *Greek* Copies, by way of Notes; to shew that the *Hebrew* words might have been interpreted in another manner, and it happened afterwards, that the *Marginal* Note or reading passed into the Text: Seeing it was the custom at that time, to have Dictionaries of the words of every famous Author; I make no Question, but that there was also composed a Dictionary, containing the words of the Bible, and also of every Book thereof in particular. The *Jewish Greeks*, who read in their Synagogues the *Hebrew* Text of the Law and the Prophets, and who joyned thereunto the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint, had their Dictionaries of that kind written in *Greek*, in which they marked the different significations of the *Hebrew* words. There is for example, in that Passage of *Jeremy* we now treat of, the *Hebrew* word פָּאִי־סָדָי which in the Septuagint, is rendred *παλαιδιῶναι*. But seeing in other places they have translated the same *Hebrew* word *πύσσαι*, and that was noted in the Dictionaries; some one or other would place in the Margin of his Copy, *πύσσαι* over against *παλαιδιῶναι*, and this first reading which was then in the Margin, by way of note only, was afterwards put in the Text, and it has remained alone in the Edition of *Rome*.

This observation is absolutely necessary, for the discerning of many false Glosses that are in the Septuagint, from the true reading; some examples of which I would set down, but that I fear it will take up too much room. *St. Jerome*, who had not considered this, judged of the Version of the Septuagint by the Copy which he had; and took no notice that that Version was altered by false Glosses in the most ancient Copies; and even a long time before *Origen*, whose critical observations afforded no remedy for that imperfection. This principle being once established, may serve as a rule to justify the citations of the Evangelists and the Apostles, which

which differ not so much from the ancient *Greek* Version, as St. *Jerome* believed.

Nevertheless that Learned Father found four or five Passages, which he pretends to be cited in the New Testament as they are in the *Hebrew*; whereas they are otherwise in the Septuagint: He does frequently object the same to his Adversaries, to shew them, that the Evangelists and Apostles being *Hebrews*, had consulted the *Hebrew* more than the *Greek* Version. Therein he takes Sanctuary, to avoid the reproaches which from all sides are cast upon him, about his new Translation of the Bible: And thus, (as he thinks) St. *Matthew* has rendred the words of *Hosea*, *I have called my Son out of Egypt*. (b) There is no doubt (saith he) but that St. *Matthew* did make use of the *Hebrew* here; because the Septuagint has it thus, *I have called my Children out of Egypt*. Let those (he adds) who translate my Version, consult the Scripture from whence the Evangelists took this Passage; he repeats the same thing in his Commentary on St. *Matthew*; (i) where he does ask those who reject the *Hebrew* Copy of the *Jews*, in what place of the Septuagint, they shall find that which is cited there: And seeing he believed that they could not possibly find the passage, he does refer them to his new Translation of the Prophet *Hosea*. But he himself resolves the doubt, by adding, in favour of those who did oppose him, *propter contentiosos*, that St. *Matthew* in that place, had cited the words of Chap. 23. of Numbers; *Θεὸς ὁ ἔξαγαγὼν αὐτὸν ἐκ Αἰγύπτου* i.e. *God who Num. 23. brought him out of Egypt*. And this is in effect the Opinion of 22. the most Learned *Greek* Commentators on the Scriptures, who lived before St. *Jerome*. (k) *It is written in the Book of Numbers* (says *Theodore* of *Heraclea*, upon this place of St. *Matthew*, *God called him out of Egypt*.

When 'tis also supposed, that St. *Matthew* had in his view that Passage of the Prophet *Hosea*, which is more probable; why does he deny that it was from the beginning in the Septuagint, as St

(b) *Pro eo quod nos diximus, ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum, Septuaginta translulerunt, ex Aegypto vocavi filios ejus, quod in Hebraico non habetur; nullique dubium est Matthaeum de hoc loco sumpsisse testimonium juxta Hebraicam veritatem. Ergo qui detrahunt nostrae translationi videant Scripturam de qua Evangelista hoc testimonium sumpserit. Hieron. Comm. in Os. lib. 3. cap. 11.*

(i) *Respondeant qui Hebraicorum voluminum denegant veritatem, ubi hoc in Septuaginta legatur Interpretibus: quod cum non invenerint, nos eis dicemus in Osée Prophetâ scriptum, sicut & exemplaria probare possunt quæ nuper edidimus. Hieron. Comm. in Matth. lib. 1. cap. 2.*

(k) *Ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῇ δευτέρῃ λέγεται, Θεὸς ὁ ἔξαγαγε ἐκ Αἰγύπτου αὐτόν. Theod. Heracl. in Cat. Gr. in Matth.*

Matthew has cited it; and that that difference does proceed from those who altered the ancient *Greek* Version by their Glosses? They believed, that by translating τέκνα αὐτοῦ, his Children, (as if it had been in the *Hebrew*, בְּנֵי בְנֵי instead of בְּנֵי,) the sense would be the more clear, because that which follows is put in the Plural Number. There might other examples be given of alterations of that kind, which must be imputed to those who changed the ancient *Greek* Version of the Septuagint, by their false Glosses. 'Tis therefore very probable, that the reading in that place of the Septuagint, was formerly the same as it is in *St. Matthew*, and likewise in *Aquila*, who also translated that passage of the Prophet *Hosea*, by these words, Ἔξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεισά μὲ καὶ υἱόν μου, I have called my Son out of Egypt.

Zach. 12.
10.

St. Jerome does yet triumph over his Adversaries, in his Commentary upon the words of the Prophet *Zechary*; They looked upon me whom they have pierced: *St. John*, who cited that passage in his Gospel, does give it in the same manner, according to the *Hebrew* Text; whereas in the Septuagint, it is, They looked upon me, because they have insulted. (1) *St. John*, (says that Father) being an *Hebrew* born, did not much regard its being read in the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint: On the contrary, he has rendered that place of *Zechary*, word for word, as it was in the *Hebrew*. But if one will not believe him, he must shew the place of Scripture, from which *St. John* took the same. He further adds, that the likeness of the Letter *R* and *D* in the *Hebrew*, was the cause of the false Translation of the Seventy Interpreters, ob similitudinem literarum error est natus, because they read (as he thinks) רָקְדוּ for רָקְדוּ.

But in my opinion, seeing *St. John* did follow the Septuagint more than the *Hebrew*, in all the Passages of his Gospel, there is no reason to maintain, that, in that place, he consulted the *Hebrew* Copy of the *Jews*; without any regard to the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint: Which makes me believe, that at the beginning, it was read in the Septuagint, as it was in the *Hebrew*, and in *St. John*. The change of Letters of that nature, gave occasion of altering the true and ancient Text in other places: And this happened to that Passage of *Zechary*, which ought to be amended in the *Greek* Version

(1) *Joannes Evangelista* qui de pectore Domini hausit sapientiam, *Hebraeus ex Hebraeis*, quem *Salvator* amabat plurimum, non magnopere curavit quid *Græcè* litteræ continerent, sed verbum interpretatus verbo est, ut in *Hebraeo* legerat, & tempore domiticae passionis dixit esse completum. Quod si quis non recipit, det testimonium de quo sanctarum scripturarum loco *Joannes* ista protulerit. Hieron. Comm. in Zach. lib. 3. c. 12.

of the Septuagint, according to the reading in the Gospel of St. *John*. That which does confirm this Opinion, is, that St. *Cyprian* did read it after that manner, in the ancient Latin Version, which was taken from the Septuagint: The Rendition of that Father has more Authority in this case, than that of some *Greek* Scholiasts, who have also read it ~~Hebrew~~ *they insulted*; as it is in St. *John*, agreeable to the *Hebrew* Text. For these Scholiasts in their Expositions, do frequently follow *Aquila*, or some other *Greek* Interpreter without declaring that they do so: And therefore 'tis necessary that we be cautious herein, that we do not confound the Version of the Septuagint, with other ancient *Greek* Interpreters.

This should be the place for the examples of the alterations we spake of, whereby the ancient *Greek* Rendition was very much changed; but it would take up too much time: It suffices that we have touched something of it, in general, to justify the Citations of the Evangelists and of the Apostles. Neither will I stay, to examine particularly, some other Passages of the Old Testament, which St. *Jerome* pretends to have been cited by the Apostles, in their Writings, rather according to the *Hebrew* than according to the Septuagint. For besides that it does require a long time to discuss them, the rules that are confirmed already, are sufficient to Answer all that Father's Objections, who himself has acknowledged, in many places of his Works, that the Disciples of Jesus Christ, who Preached the Gospel to a People that spake the *Greek* Tongue, must have made use of the ancient *Greek* Version of the Septuagint, which was in the hands of every one; and not of the *Hebrew* Bible, which was read by none but the *Jews*: Besides there were but few amongst them, who could have understood it. We come now to the other Objection, which is brought against the Books of the New Testament, and which consists in a supposition, that the Apostles and the Evangelists have not only changed the words of the Passages which they cite, but that they have likewise wrested the same, by giving them a sense altogether different from the meaning of the Authors.

CHAP. XXI.

A Discussion of some other Objections against the Books of the New Testament : The Evangelists and Apostles (in the manner of their explaining the Passages of the Old Testament , and applying them to the Messiah) followed the Custom which then obtained amongst the Jews. There are many words in the New Testament, which have a larger signification than they have in the Old : And that can be attributed to nothing but to that usage, and to a tradition received amongst the Jews.

THE Present Times gave not a beginning to the very great and difficult Objections, that have been formed against the Testimonies of the Old Testament, which the Evangelists and Apostles have made use of in their Writings, for the Confirmation of the Truth of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. *Celsus, Porphyrius, Julian* and the *Jews* have brought them against the Christians, that they might thereby shew, (as they think) the weakness of those Proofs, upon which the Christian Religion is founded : But they are deceived, when they persuade themselves, that Christianity has nothing else but such sort of Proofs, for its Foundation. The Miracles of Jesus Christ are evident Proofs of his Mission : And therefore, if it should be supposed with them, that the Passages we speak of, are not always justly applyed, it cannot be concluded from thence, that the Christian Religion is built on a false Foundation.

That we may make a right judgment of the Reasonings of Jesus Christ and his Disciples, in the Books of the New Testament, we must have recourse to the practice of the *Jews* at that time ; and if it be proved, that their manner of reasoning and applying to the *Messias* certain Passages of Scripture, is agreeable to the usage of that time, they cannot without great injustice be blamed. They will be sufficiently acquitted of that which is charged upon them, if we consult the ancient Books of the *Jews*, especially the *Chaldaick* Paraphrases, and the *Medraschim*, or ancient Allegorical Commentaries. They have; in those Works, attributed to the *Messiah*, many places

Places of Scripture, which seem to have a quite different sense, if the Letter be only considered.

The Rabbins likewise give two senses to many Passages, one of which is merely Historical, and another that is more large, which in some sort may be called Mystical or Allegorical; although in effect it is as much literal in its own nature as the former. Thus they expound the same Passage of *David*, and of the *Messias*: All their old *Medraschim* or Allegorical Commentaries, which are the most ancient Expositions that they have of the Bible, follow this Method. Their Doctors never began to insist on the literal sense, till they had occasion to dispute with the Christians: and it was easie to make Answer to them, according to no other Principles than those which they themselves had established. Why then do they think it strange, that the Evangelists and Apostles, who came from amongst them, should make use of the same Principles to oppose them? Why do they persuade us, that in the matter of the *Messiah*, there ought to be no such Proofs used, as are Founded on the Mystical & Allegorical sense of Scriptures, since they themselves have always observed that Method?

The truth is, if the *Jews* be much press'd about those Passages of the Old Testament, which they make use of to confirm the belief of a *Messiah*, which they have placed amongst the Fundamental Articles of their Religion; it will be hard enough for them to Answer those Objections that may be brought against them upon the point; unless they have recourse to those Mystical and Allegorical senses, which being Founded upon the Tradition of their Fathers, ought to pass for real Proofs. There has been a certain Rabbin amongst their ancient Doctors, who absolutely denied that the *Messiah* should come, because he did not believe, that it was Founded upon the literal and evident Proofs of Scripture. They did not, for all that, exclude him from their Communion; by which it does appear, that the Article was not yet (at that time) in the number of those they call Fundamental.

The *Jews* do renounce their Principle, when they object against the Disciples of Jesus Christ, that their Expositions are not purely literal, but Allegorical, and that there can nothing be concluded from an Allegory. 'Tis true, that that which is merely Allegorical cannot suffice as a positive Proof for the Confirmation of a Religion: But when those Allegories are Founded on Tradition, they may be used and applyed to Matters of Fact, which are already agreed upon by that Tradition. In this manner, all the Objections of the *Jews* may be Answered, without a particular enumeration of those Passages, which they pretend to have been falsely applyed.

plied to our *Messiah* in the New Testament: for they cannot abdicate that Principle which is taken from their own Doctors, and their Custom, lest they themselves should renounce the belief of a *Messiah* to come.

Moses Bar cepha, a Syrian Author, having considered this Truth, (m) does put those in the number of *Hereticks*, who alledge that the Old Testament ought not to be Mystically Explained, but only Literally, and according to the Historical Sense. If that be so (says that Author) the Heresies of the *Manichæes*, and the *Marcionites*, are thereby set up. It cannot henceforth be shewn whence the ancient Fathers, and the Prophets, had the account which they gave us of the coming of the *Messiah*. In a word, he does assure us, that that Opinion is mere *Judaism*. To which it may be added, that it is mere *Sadduceism*: for the true *Jews* are all agreed, that a Sense that is merely Literal and Historical, separated from Tradition, cannot in any wise confirm the Articles of their Religion.

This Principle is so true, that the *Antitrinitarians*, (who refuse to receive the Traditions of the Catholicks, in the Disputes betwixt them, and who do only admit the Literal Expositions of Scripture, without any dependance on Tradition) do plainly see themselves obliged to acknowledge some other Sense than what is Literal, when they are to enter into the Lists with the *Jews*. This does plainly appear in the Works of *Socinus*, *Enjedine*, and of some other *Unitaries*. In which they give evident proofs of the inconstancy of their Principle: They did not foresee, that whilst they framed certain Maxims against the Catholicks, they did at the same time give Authority to *Sadduceism*, and *Manicheism*.

Faustus one of the Heroes of the *Manichean* Party, not finding in the Books of *Moses* any Passage which he could literally understand of *Jesus Christ*, and otherwise perceiving that it was in plain terms asserted in the New Testament, that *Moses* had written concerning *Jesus Christ*, chose rather to say that the Writings of the Evangelists had been corrupted, than to renounce his own Principle. There was a greater Harmony manifest in his Reasonings

(m) Sicut inter hæreticos qui contendunt, unimè convenire ut Veteris Testamenti scripta mysticè atque aliter quàm de ipsis rebus interpretentur, graviterque accusant eos qui contrà faciunt. Atqui si ita statuas, multa ut consequantur absurda necesse est. — obfirmabitur Manetis & Marcionis sententia, qui dicebant Vetus Testamentum nequaquam ab auctore Deo Christi Patre esse. Præterea nisi in illo recondita fuerint arcana sensa, unde potuere præci Patres, Prophetæ aliique sancti viri intelligere Christum olim venturum? — Denique si ita cum illis hæreticis sentimus, profectò in Judaismum incidimus. Mos. Barcephæ, Comm. de Parad. part. 1. c. 3.

and Maxims, than in those of the *Antitrinitarians*, who received Tradition in some things and in others did reject it. They argue against the *Jews* in the matters of Religion, after another manner than against the *Catholics*, seeing those things do consist in matters of Fact, they cannot be proved merely by the light of Reason; Tradition is likewise to be consulted. And therefore, so long as the *Jews*, shall with bare Reasons, oppose the Exposition of the Passages of the Old Testament, which the Evangelists and the Apostles have cited in the New, they cannot possibly conclude any thing against them. For it will be easily demonstrated, that those Writers, in that matter, followed the custom and Tradition of their Time.

The Book where the most of that sort of citations are found, is the Epistle of St. *Paul* to the *Hebrews*, where we find nothing else but Passages of the Old Testament, explained in a manner that is altogether Allegorical and Foreign to the Letter; which has also given an occasion to some Writers to suspect that St. *Paul* was not the Author. But it seems, on the contrary, that if we reflect upon the *Pharisees* Method, in their Expounding Scripture, it cannot be attributed to any other than to that Holy Apostle, who having Studied in *Jerusalem*, under the Doctor *Gamaliel*, did penetrate into all the most refined Points of their secret and mystical Interpretations of the Bible. In effect, after I had recommended the reading of this Epistle to a *Jew*, who was well Read in his own ancient Authors; he having perused it, freely declared that it must needs have been written by some great * *Mekubal* of his own Na-

* A 'Man
of Tradi-
tion.

tion. And he was so far from telling me that St. *Paul* had wrested the true Sense of Scripture with his Allegories at pleasure, that he extolled his profound skill in the sublime Sense of the Bible, and always returned to his great *Mekubal*, of whom he never spoke but with admiration.

Enjedine, a subtil Unitary, was so much persuaded of this Truth, that after he had proposed the most part of those Reasons which are ordinarily objected against the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, he adds (n) that the most part of the Passages, which are cited in this Epistle, out of the Old Testament, are not to be understood in a literal, but in a mystical and spiritual Sense, otherwise it were impossible to avoid

(n) *Præmonemus omnia penè testimonia & exempla quæ ex Veteri Testamento huc transferuntur, non secundum historię veritatem & sensum, ut vocant, literalem, sed mysticè & sensu spirituali intelligi & allegorico ad Novum Testamentum applicari & explicari. Quod ita manifestum est, ut nisi quis hoc admittat, in absurda manifestissima incidat.* Georg. Enjed. explic. loc. Vet. & Nov. Test. explic. loc. Epist. ad Heb.

several manifest absurdities. He does likewise suppose in another place, that this manner of Exposition of Scripture, was then approved by the *Jews*, and that Jesus Christ made use of it, when he disputed with the *Pharisees*, who received the same. He brings for an example these Words of *Psalms* cix. 1. *The Lord said unto my Lord, &c.* which Jesus Christ understood of the *Messiah*, and not of *David*, (o) *when Christ*, (saith *Enjedine*) explained that Passage in a mystical Sense, he did nothing but what was very pertinent: for there were three Sects amongst the *Jews* at that time. The *Sadducees* did only receive the Literal Sense of the Scripture. The *Pharisees* on the contrary, besides the Literal, did also approve of the Mystical Sense. And therefore in his Disputing with the *Pharisees*, he followed a Custom in which they were agreed, that is, of giving Mystical Expositions to Scripture. Seeing he knew that the Psalm, which was understood of *Solomon*, or rather of *David*, according to the Literal Sense, was ordinarily applied to the *Messiah*, he freely declares that *David* had the *Messiah* in his view, when he writ it. Which the *Pharisees* could not deny, unless they would have renounced their own Sect.

This observation of *Enjedine*, does agree with the Principle which was formerly established in this Discourse for answering the *Jews*, who accused the Evangelists, and the Apostles, of giving false Interpretations to the Passages of the Old Testament. I will further say, that there were certain Traditions, which were not only received by the *Pharisees*, but also by the other Sects. I reckon in the number of those Traditions, the belief of a *Messiah*, which it would have been hard to prove, only by the Books of *Moses*. Nevertheless the *Samaritans*, who owned nothing but the *Pentateuch*, to be Divine and Canonical Scripture, did believe at that time, and still believe the *Messiah* at this day: and the ground that they have for it, is taken from some Passages of the Law, which appear to have another Sense, if they be Literally Expounded. Whence I conclude, that this Spiritual and Mystical Sense, was not only in use amongst the *Pharisees*, but also amongst the other Sects. Nevertheless the

(o) Quod autem Christus hoc loco usus est mysticâ interpretandi Scripturas formâ, observavit τὸ ὁμολογῶν. Cum enim essent tres Judeorum sectæ, & Sadduceæ solum literalem Scripturæ sensum admitterent, Pharisei verò etiam mysticum approbarent, cum Phariseis disputans arripuit hoc quod illi pro confesso & concessò habebant, licere nimirum Scripturas mysticè interpretari: & quia norat illum Psalmum qui literaliter de Salomone, aut potius de ipso Davide est compositus, spiritu aliter referri solere ad Messiam, idè tam confidenter hunc Psalmum de Davide, de Messia conscriptum esse affirmat. Quod illi negare, nisi sectæ suæ renunciare vellent, non poterant. Enjed. explic. loc. Matth.

Pharisees had abused it, by allowing it too great a latitude. And therefore our Lord does sometimes reproach them, for this bad use which they had made of Traditions, yet without condemning the Traditions themselves. The *Jews Caraites* also, who very much despised the Fables that abound in the *Talmud*, do not absolutely reject all the Traditions which are contained in that Book.

If the *Unitaries* would make a just reflection on the Principle which has established, and which may serve as an answer to the most part of the objections of the *Jews* against the Books of the Old Testament, they would not so much insist upon the Literal Exposition of certain Passages of Scripture, which they oppose to the Theological Expositions of the ancient Fathers. Seeing the *Jews* have Authorized, by their Traditions, some Interpretations of the Old Testament, that are in no wise Literal: the Doctors of the Church have also used the like in their Exposition of Scripture. Interpretations of that kind are found in all the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers. I shall content my self to produce in this place the Testimony of an Author, who cannot be suspected by the *Unitaries*. That is *Theodore of Heraclia*, a favourer of the *Arian* Party, and who writ learned Commentaries on the Bible: but there remains nothing of them, but some fragments in the Collections, or Chains of the *Greek* Fathers.

That famous Divine does establish these two sorts of Senses, viz. the Literal, and the Theological, and he does apply them to those words of the Psalmist, (p) *The heavens were established by the word of the Lord, and all their host by the breath of his mouth.* he does Expound Literally the word *de λόγῳ*, Word, by ἀποφάσις, Decree; and the other words πνεῦμα σώματος, the breath of his mouth, by τῆ δυνάμεως, his Power: so that according to the Literal Sense of that Passage, the World was Created by the Will, and by the Omnipotency of God. (q) This (saith *Theodore*) is the Sense which does here present it self: and he does afterwards add, that according to the true Theological Sense, we ought to understand the Word of God and the Holy Ghost. We may also call that a Theological Sense which was given to many Passages of the Old Testament, by Jesus Christ and his Apostles; because it was agreeable to the Theology of the *Jews* of those times, chiefly to that of the *Pharisees*, who Composed the leading Sect, and the most received amongst the People. The *Jews* at this day, do altogether follow their Opinions. The first Christians, who re-

(p) Τῷ λόγῳ οὗ κατεῖν οἱ ὕενοι ἐστειλάθησαν, καὶ τῇ πνεύματι οὗ σώματος αὐτοῦ πάντα ἡ δυνάμις αὐτοῦ.

(q) Τὸ τοῦ λόγου ὁ ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἡ ὁ ἀληθὴς θεολογία τὸν τῷ Θεῷ ἀποδίδουσι λόγον οὗν τῇ ἀγίᾳ πνεύματι. Theod. Heracl. Cat. in Psalm. 32.

ceived the Sacred Writings from them, have likewise imitated them in their manner of Expounding those Books.

Michael Servetus, did also, in many places of his Works, acknowledge this Mystical and Spiritual Sense, which he makes to go jointly with the Literal. He does alledge, that by that way Jesus Christ may be clearly found in the Books of the Law. He thinks that there is nothing but what is Natural in the Application that *St. Paul* made of these words, Psalm ci. (*Thou hast created the earth from the beginning*,) to Jesus Christ as the Creator of Heaven and Earth. *Which words*, (saith he) *though in the opinion of some they have but a forced Sense, when they are applyed to Christ, yet that is the proper Sense, as the Apostle does shew*, Hebr. i. He does insist somewhat long on this Subject, Expounding in the same manner, many other Psalms, which he understands of Jesus Christ, although it seems, that according to the Natural Sense, they ought to be understood in general of God. *The like is to be judged of other Psalms, though they, by reason of their ignorance of Christ, do otherwise expound them.* This is no place for to examine the Consequences which *Servetus* does draw from his Principle. I brought his words, only to shew, that the greatest Enemies of Tradition, are obliged in their Expositions of many Passages of Scripture to acknowledge a Theological Sense, which can be founded on nothing but Tradition, and common Belief, seeing they do agree that they who are ignorant of Jesus Christ, put others Senses on the Scriptures.

Faustus Socinus did not find a more short or effectual way than this, to answer the objections that the *Jews*, and other enemies of the Christian Religion, make against the Books of the New Testament. He does suppose it to have been constantly agreed upon (r) that the Passages of the Old Testament, that are cited in the New, have had several Senses, it being true, especially as to the Prophecies, which (according to his Opinion) were so Composed, that the things foretold might be concealed till their accomplishment should happen. He further says, that we ought not to think variety to be surprising, seeing the *Jews*, who opposed the Evangelists and Apostles, do agree to it. But I question if that Unitary can convince the *Jews* of this Truth, if he build on no other Principles than those which he makes use of in his Disputing against the Catholicks. Indeed to speak exactly, there is but one (Literal) Sense of every particular Passage of Scripture. That other Sense, which admits of a greater

(r) *Sæpe Spiritus Sanctus unâ prædictione aut affirmatione plura complecti voluit, idque ut semper mos præcipue vaticinationum fuit ad rem ipsam prædictam occultandam, saltem aliquâ ex parte, donec ipsa res existeret. Soc. Lect. Sac.*

latitude; and which the Christians are obliged to own, is founded on the received and warranted traditions of the *Jews*. Seeing the *Jews* have, as well as the Catholicks, approved of Traditions of that kind, they cannot accuse the Apostles of having wrested the true Sense of several Passages of Scripture by false Interpretations, unless they themselves do renounce the Expositions of their own Doctors. Let us now particularly examin some of those Passages, which the Emperor *Julian*, and the *Jews* have objected against the Christians.

The first that presents it self, is taken from those Words of the Prophet *Esay*, *Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bring forth a Son, and thou shall call his name Emmanuel*. St. *Matthew* has applied them to the *Messiah*, who was born of a Virgin, and has rendred them after this manner. *Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bring forth a Son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel*. The *Jews* do accuse this Evangelist, of an unfaithful citation, and also a false application of the words of the Prophet. They say first, that the *Hebrew* word *Alma* does not signifie a Virgin, as St. *Matthew* has rendred it, but simply, a young Woman, whether she be a Virgin or not, which they endeavour to prove from other places of Scripture.

St. *Ferom* does assure us on the contrary, that the *Hebrew* word (1) *Alma* does properly signifie a Virgin, and also a Virgin hid or shut up; and that it has likewise that signification in the *Carthaginian* Language, which derives its Original from the *Hebrew*. The learned observation of that Father is very pertinent, not only to justifie St. *Matthew*, but also to shew, that in the *Septuagint*, the *Hebrew* word *Alma* is very well Translated. And therefore seeing it not necessary to prosecute this matter, with a long train of critical observations, nor run through all the places of the Old Testament, in particular, where this word *Alma* is found, it will suffice to bring against the *Jews*, their own ancient *Greek* Version, which St. *Matthew*, or rather his Interpreter, has followed. It cannot be said that those *Jews*, who lived so long a time before *Jesus Christ*, did by a false Translation, on purpose, corrupt the Sense of that place. The accusations with which they charge St. *Matthew*, fall on those of their own Nation.

They say in the second place, that in the *Hebrew*, it is not *καλέσων*, i.e. *they shall call*, but *καλέσεις*, *thou shall call*, which does regard the

(1) *Alma non solum puella vel virgo, sed cum abscondita dicitur secreta, quæ nunquam virorum patuerit aspectibus, sed magnâ parentum diligentia custodita sit. Linguâ quoque Punicâ, quæ de Hebræorum fontibus emanare dicitur, propriè virgo alma appellatur.* Hieron. *Comm. in Is. lib. 3. c. 7.*

young Woman, who was to call her Son *Emmanuel*. St. *Jerom* declares, that all the ancient Interpreters, have rendred it according to the *Hebrew*, *thou shalt call*. But at the same time does add, (t) that the Evangelists and the Apostles did not scrupulously limit themselves to the very words of the Passages of the Old Testament, contenting themselves to give their Sense. This is sufficient; though *εὐαγγελισται, thou shalt call*, is likewise found in some Greek Copies.

As for the Sense of this Passage, the *Jews* pretend that it cannot be applied to the *Messiah*, as St. *Matthew* has done it, seeing that place does make mention of a thing that should happen very soon afterwards. St. *Jerom* observes that they understood it of *Hezekiah*, the Son of *Achaz*, because *Samaria* was invaded under his Reign. But he does solidly refute them, by making it appear to them, that *Achaz* was already far advanced in years before he came to the Kingdom. He brings, in the same place, another Exposition of a (u) Christian, who (in his Opinion) did *Judaize*. That Author believed, that in that place it was spoken of the Prophet *Esay's* Wife, who had two Children, *Jesub* and *Emmanuel*, that the latter was the Type of *Jesus* Christ. But whatever St. *Jerom* does say of it, I do not perceive, that there is any thing affirmed therein, but what is altogether consonant to the Principles of the Christian Religion, and also to those which he does elsewhere maintain. That Prophecie, as the most part of the rest, has a double Sense: the one, which is here spoken of, has relation to the Prophet *Esay's* Wife, the other, which is of a greater latitude, and may be called Spiritual or Mystical, does point at the times of the *Messiah*; and it is also in some manner Literal, because it is founded on the Theology and Traditions of the *Jews*. It will be easie to answer their objections, by supposing these two Senses: whereas if the Exposition of that Prophecie be rigorously restrained to the *Messiah*, it will be more difficult to satisfy them. Seeing this Principle is of great importance, and may be useful for the resolution of many difficulties of this nature, it is fit to confirm it by the Authority of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, and chiefly St. *Jerom*, who has mentioned it in his Commentaries upon the Prophet *Daniel*. *Porphyrius* did pretend that there is nothing in that Book but what is Historical. He applied to *Antiochus* that which

(t) In multis testimoniis quæ Evangelistæ vel Apostoli de libris veteribus assumpserunt curiosius attendendum est non eos verborum ordinem secutos esse, sed sensum. Hieron.

(u) Quidam de nostris judæizans Esaiam Prophetam duos filios habuisse contendit, Jesub & Emmanuel; & Emmanuel de Prophetissâ uxore ejus esse generatum in typum Domini Salvatoris. Hieron. ibid.

the Christians Expound of Antichrist, and the end of the World. The Christians nevertheless, did not wholly reject the Interpretation of *Porphyrus*; but they affirmed that *Antiochus* was a Type of Antichrist. *Typum eum volunt*, (says St. *Jerom* in speaking of the ancient Doctors of the Church) *Antichristi habere, & quæ in illo ex parte præcesserint, in Antichristo ex toto esse implenda*. And to make their Opinion the more clear, he further adds this excellent Maxim: (*) that it is usual for the Holy Scripture to describe the Truth of future things by Types. Which he confirmed by Psalm lxxi. which is understood of Jesus Christ, and which is nevertheless applied to *Solomon*, though every thing spoken in that Psalm cannot agree to him.

Those ancient Ecclesiastical Writers did conclude from thence, that (y) seeing Jesus Christ had *Solomon*, and other Saints of the Old Testament for Types; we ought likewise to believe, that Antichrist had *Antiochus* for a Type; he having been a very wicked King, who persecuted the Saints, and violated the Temple. St. *Jerom* does explain the Prophecie of *Daniel* according to those two Senses: and seeing in that he cannot be charged with having favoured the impieties of *Porphyrus*, who alledged that the Book of *Daniel* was not so ancient as the *Jews* and Christians did pretend; those cannot be accused of *Judaism*, who received a part of the Expositions that the *Jews* have given of the Prophecies, and who do withal, (with the Evangelists and Apostles, apply them to the *Messiah* in a larger Sense.

(x) *Hunc esse morem Scripturæ Sanctæ, ut futurorum veritatem præmittat in typis, juxta illud quod de Domino Salvatore in 71. Psalm dicitur, qui prænotatur Salomonis, & omnia quæ de eo dicuntur Salomoni non valent convenire. Apud Hieron. Comm. in Dan. c. 11.*

(y) *Sicut igitur Salvator habet & Salomonem & cæteros sanctos in typum adventus sui; sic & Antichristus pessimum Regem Antiochum qui sanctos persecutus est, templumque violavit, rectè typum sui habuisse credendus est. Hieron. ibid.*

CHAP. XXII.

A particular Examination of many Passages of the Old Testament, cited by the Apostles in a sense that seems to be altogether Foreign. Some difficulties formed against their Writings are cleared; some Principles are established, which may Answer the Objections of the Jews, and the Emperor Julian.

AS it would require much time, so it is of no use, to explain here all the Passages of the Old Testament, which the Evangelists and the Apostles have cited in their Writings, because Commentators may be consulted thereupon, especially *Maldonat* and *Grotius*, who commonly follow the Principle that we have already established. That Principle did appear so much the more reasonable, as being equally founded on a joint suffrage of the *Jews* and *Christians*: Seeing I design to give general Rules, for answering the Objections of the *Jews*, against the Books of the New Testament, 'tis sufficient, if I only take notice of some of those citations, by which means these Rules may be the more manifest.

One of the places that are most difficult to be reconciled, is the Passage of the Prophet *Micah*, which is cited in the eleventh Chap. of *St. Matthew*, v. 6. (a) *St. Jerome* does assure us, that it is as clear as the day, that it does neither agree with the *Hebrew Text*, nor with the *Greek* of the *Septuagint*. He brings at the same time, the Opinion of some Authors, who believed (b) that the Evangelists and Apostles were not at all exact in their citations, because they trusted to their memory: But seeing this Answer does rather destroy than establish the truth of the Gospels, he has recourse to another solution. He says, that they are the *Jewish Doctors*, who speak in that place; so that *St. Matthew* intending to shew, that those Do-

(a) Quod testimonium nec Hebraico nec Septuaginta Interpretibus convenire, neque quoque tacente, perspicuum est. Hieron. lib. 2. in Mic. c. 5.

(b) Sunt autem qui asserant in omnibus penè testimoniis quæ de Veteri Testamento sumuntur, istiusmodi esse errorem, ut aut ordo mutetur, aut verba, & interdum sensus quoque ipse diversus sit, vel Apostolis vel Evangelistis non ex libro carpentibus testimonia, sed memoriæ credentibus quæ nonnunquam fallitur. Hieron. ibid.

ctors neglected the study of the Scripture, has cited that Passage in the same manner as they had delivered it. But it does not at all appear, that the Evangelist meant to accuse them of ignorance.

Yet it cannot be denied, but that they were *Jews* who spake to *Herod*, to whom we ought consequently to impute the citation of that Passage of *Micah*. *St. Matthew* as an Historian, does only report that which passed betwixt *Herod* and the Principal Doctors of the *Jews*. That Prince did ask them, where their *Messiah* should be Born; they made Answer, that he should be Born in *Bethlehem*, of the Tribe of *Juda*; and they proved it by that Passage of the Prophet *Micah*, and thou *Bethlehem in the Land of Judah*, art not the least amongst the Princes of *Judah*, for out of thee a Governor shall come, who shall rule my People *Israel*. If this is not a faithful citation, the error ought not to be imputed to *St. Matthew*, but to the *Jewish* Doctors who spake it. Was it possible (they may say) that all the Learned Men who were in *Jerusalem* at that time, should be deceived in citing a Passage that was so well known to them? Ought they not to have reported it, as it is in the *Hebrew* Text, where we read that *Bethlehem* is a little City? On the contrary the Doctors affirmed, in *St. Matthew*, that it was not a little one.

Some Commentators have endeavour'd to reconcile this contradiction, by supposing the *Jews* to have read that place with an Interrogation: And the truth is, seeing there are no marks in the *Hebrew* for such Interrogations; it may be expounded in that sense, without changing the Prophetical Text; which it were easie to confirm by many Examples from the Writings of the *Jews*. *Gabriel Sionita* has also translated the *Syriack* in that place, with an Interrogation, though it be wholly agreeable to the *Hebrew*. *Tertullian* and *St. Cyprian* did likewise read *non*, in the ancient Latin Version, as if it were to be read in the *Greek* of the Septuagint, *ὡς εἰς πόλιν*, which Reading is confirm'd by *Origen*: Nevertheless, it might have so been, Orig. lib.
1. cont.
Cels. that *St. Matthew's* rendition instead of the reading of the Prophet, was put in those Writers, or that they themselves did cite the words of *Micah*, as they are in *St. Matthew*: *St. Jerome*, in his ancient Version, read *modica es*, thou art little, without a negation, agreeable to the *Hebrew* Text.

Mr. Pocock found another way of reconciling those two places, without having recourse to an interrogation: He does alledge, that the *Hebrew* word *קטן* which is in the Prophet *Micah*; and which is ordinarily interpreted *small*, does in that place signifie *great*, because it does equally signifie both. And this he does likewise prove by the testimony of some Rabbins; and it may be further proved by the ancient *Greek* Interpreters. 'Tis probable that the *Jewish* Doctors

Doctors reported that Passage to King Herod, according to the exposition it received in the Glosses of that time, which were read to the People, without keeping to the words of their Text, which was only understood by the Learned. That which confirms me in this Opinion, is, that instead of these words, *and thou Bethlehem Ephrata*, or as it is in the Septuagint, *Bethlehem the House of Ephrata*, they put these words, which were more known at that time, *and thou Bethlehem in the Land of Judah*.

There is likewise read in the *Hebrew*, and in the Septuagint, *amongst the Thousands of Judah*, and in St. Matthew, *amongst the Princes of Judah*: This different Interpretation does proceed from this, that the same *Hebrew* word that is in the Prophet, may be interpreted both ways, according to the different vowels, or rather according to the caprice of the Transcribers, who did add or take away at their pleasure, the letter *vau*, in which the difference of interpretation does consist. The Scribes did read it with the letter *vau* וְיָמֵי, *aluphe*, whereas the Septuagint read it, as it is at this day amongst the *Jews*, in the *Hebrew* of the *Masorets* וְיָמֵי *alphe*. There is nothing more ordinary in the *Hebrew* Manuscript Copies of the Bible, than this kind of alteration: And therefore, when it does occur, the sense is rather to be regarded than the manner wherein the *Hebrew* words are written. The *Jews* of that time, expounded that Passage of *Micah*, as if it had been in the *Hebrew* Text, וְיָמֵי, *aluphe*, with the letter *vau*.

St. Jerome, endeavouring to justify the liberty he took, in giving more heed to the sense than words, did produce this Passage of the Prophet *Micah*, to shew, that it is quite otherwise in the *Hebrew* and in the Septuagint, than in St. Matthew. He adds withal, (c) that he did not, by that answer, charge the Evangelists with falsehood; as *Celsus*, *Porphyrius* and the Emperor *Julian* had done; but to convince his Adversaries of ignorance, and to shew them, that he might in one single Letter, take the same liberty that the Apostles had taken in Translating the Sacred Writings. It seems, that that Learned Father, does here attribute to St. Matthew, what he attributed to the *Jewish* Doctors, in his Commentaries upon the Prophet *Micah*: However, 'tis more to the purpose, that we reconcile those two different Interpretations, by having recourse to the Fountain, then by encreasing the difficulty.

(c) *Hæc replico, non ut Evangelistas arguam falsitatis, hoc quippe impiorum est Celsi, Porphyrii & Juliani; sed ut reprehensores meos arguam imperitiæ, & impetrem ab eis veniam, ut concedant mihi in simplici epistola quod in Scripturis Sanctis velint nolint Apostolis concessuri sunt. Hieron. de opt. gen. interp. ad Pammach.*

St. *Matthew* applied to the *Messiah*, in the same Chapter of his Gospel, the words of the Prophet *Hosea*, *Out of Egypt I have called my Son*: It is evident, that the Prophet speaks of the People of *Israel*, whom God calls his Son. Answer may be made to this Objection of the *Jews*, that that People was a Type of the *Messiah*, to whom, that which was spoken of *Israel*, in a literal sense, might, according to the custom of that time, be applied in a Mystical and Spiritual sense: See *Maldonat* in his Commentary on this place of St. *Matthew*, where that Learned Jesuit does, at the same time, establish solid Principles, for the exposition of the most part of the Prophetical Texts, that have been cited by the Evangelists and the Apostles. He does judiciously observe, that a Prophecy is reckoned to be accomplished, not only when 'tis truly, and in the Letter fulfilled, but also, when the thing which is figuratively signified by the words, is accomplished: He brings St. *Paul* for an example, who, in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. 1. has applied to the *Messiah*, that which is spoken of *Solomon* in the second Book of *Samuel*, Chap. 7. v. 14. *I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son*. And the same may be said of the Prophecy of *Hosea*. (d) The People of *Israel* (saith *Maldonat*) in the time of their exile in *Egypt*, may be said to be a figure of Jesus Christ, who was also to be there in Exile; as at this day, the Mystical Body of the Church, is a Figure of the natural Body of the same Jesus Christ, who is like to *Israel* in this; that both the one and the other is called the Son of God.

The *Jews* could not deny this Mystical and Spiritual sense, which is founded on Theology and their Ancient Doctors, and whereof there are Examples in the most part of their Writings: And therefore, all that they object against the Authors of the New Testament, does fall on their own heads, seeing the Evangelists and Apostles have only imitated them. In their application of the Prophecies to the *Messiah*; they followed a Method which was approved by the *Jews*, especially by the *Pharisees*. All that does remain of the *Jews* in the World (if we except the *Jews Caraites*, who are in a very small number) derive their original from the *Pharisees*, who, besides the Literal and Historical sense of Scripture, do acknowledg a Sublime and Mystical sense: Whence it is, that those senses are frequently to be found in the Commentaries of their Rabbins.

Origen, in his Writings against *Celsus*, maintained with all his

(d) *Populus ille in Aegypto exulans Christi ibidem exulaturi figura dici potest; sicut nunc corpus mysticum Ecclesie corporis naturalis Christi figura est; Et Christus populo in eo similis est, quod uterque Dei filius appelletur.* Mald. Comm. in c. 2. Matth. v. 15.

might that sublime sense of the Prophecies: He calls that sense a *Mystical Theory of the Prophets*, καὶ θεωρίαν μυστικὴν προφητῶν. He says, (e) that the Prophets did not confine their thoughts to the Historical sense, which came first in view; nor to the Words and bare Letter of the Law. He does moreover establish this general Rule (f) that the predictions of the Prophets, concerning the *Messiah* are different, some being Enigmatical, and others Allegorical, or of some other sort, there being also some of them that are Literal. It will suffice, as an Answer to the *Jews*, (who, in their disputes against the Christians, do very much insist on the Literal and Historical sense of the Prophecies,) to bring that which *Origen*, upon the like occasion answered *Celsus*; who brought in a *Jew* speaking in his Writings. He does reproach him, (g) that he does not make the *Jew* speak pertinently, and according to the Character he had given him, because he put such words in his mouth as did agree rather to a *Samaritan* or *Sadducee*, than to a true *Jew*.

I always followed this Method, when at any time I met with such *Jews*, as impugned the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, in the manner as I have already shewn: For, perceiving that they were pressed by the very Principles of their own Doctors; they never returned me any Answer but this, that the Mystical and Allegorical Interpretations of their Ancient Masters, gave a great advantage to the Christian Religion. When I ask'd them, if they would renounce the Principles of their Rabbins, to embrace those of the *Sadducees*, or even of the *Caraites*; they declared to me, that they had a very great aversion to Men of that stamp. This way is to be taken in our disputes with the *Jews* about Religion: They are mightily puzzled, when ever this Method is employed against them; because we fight against them with the same Arms that they themselves make use of, against the Sectaries whom we have already mentioned.

To return to the testimonies of the Prophets, that are cited in the New Testament; *St. Matthew* has, in the same second Chapter of his Gospel, applyed to the *Messiah*, that which is written in *Jeremiah*, Chap. 31. which seems to have no such meaning, if it be expound-

(e) Καὶ οἱ προφῆται οὐκ ἔκλειπον τὰς λέξεις καὶ τὸ γράμμα νομοθετοῦντες, &c. Orig. lib. 2. cont. Cels.

(f) Πολλοὶ προφῆται παντοδαπῶς ἐρμήνευσαν τὰς προφητίας: οἱ μὲν δὲ αἰνιγματικῶς, οἱ δὲ ἀλληγορικῶς, ἢ ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ πῶς ὅς τε αὐτοὶ λέξιν. Orig. lib. 2. cont. Cels.

(g) Περὶ ὧν καὶ τὸ ὅτι Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ ὡς πρὸς τὸν Ἰεροσόλῃμ καὶ μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν ἢ Σαδδουκαῖοι. Orig. ibid.

ed literally. *A voice was heard in Rama, a voice of lamentation and great weeping; Rachel weeping for her Children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.* (b) The Jews, (as Maldonat affirms) in their exposition of this Passage of *Jeremy*, apply it to the carrying away of the two Tribes; and there is no doubt but that is the true sense, and that by *Rachel*, all the Cities of those two Tribes are to be understood.

Jerem.
31. 15.

If it be so, the Jews may say, why has your Evangelist expounded it of the murder of the Children, that happened upon the occasion of your *Messiah*? 'Tis easie to make Answer, that as to that, there is nothing that is extraordinary, and which is not agreeable to the expositions of their own Authors. *Aderas*, (to use their own terms) or an Allegorical sense, does very well agree to the murder of those Infants: The similitude that was between those two Events, gave an occasion to St. *Matthew*, to apply that which had been already accomplished in the time of the Tribes of *Judah* and *Benjamin*. This was observed by *Crellius*, after *Maldonat*, *referuntur à Matthæo*, (saith that Unitary,) *ad eadem Infantium Bethlehemiticorum propter rei similitudinem, quia id quod olim quidem impletum fuit in aliis, in illis infantibus impletum fuit.* *Faustus Socinus*, (who also believed, that the Jews stood upon the literal sense of that Passage of *Jeremy*) observed, that *Tremellius* and *Junius* alledged, that it could not be understood literally, any other way than according to St. *Matthew's* Interpretation. (i) But in that (saith he) there is no absurdity, if two senses be admitted in the Prophecies of the Old Testament: It does also appear, that it is proper and agreeable to those Prophecies. The truth is, if those two senses be not owned, we shall give an occasion to the Jews to accuse the Evangelists and the Apostles, for having falsely applied the Ancient Prophecies.

We find in the same Chapter of St. *Matthew*, another citation out of the Prophets, in general, which seems to be more Foreign, than any that has been yet taken notice of. That Evangelist saith, that, *Jesus came and dwelt in a City called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet, he shall be called a Nazarene.* Seeing he named no Prophet in particular, the difficulty is to know,

(h) *Hebræi de abductione duarum tribuum Judæ & Benjamin interpretantur; nec dubium est ex circumstantiis Jeremie, quin de illis intelligatur, & per Rachelem tota regio duarum tribuum significetur.* Mald. Comm. in c. 2. *Matth. v. 18.*

(i) *Verum nulla hic est absurditas, si duplici sensu intelligantur prædictiones Veteris Testamenti esse prolata. Imò hoc videtur proprium & consentaneum prædictionibus esse.* Soc. *Lect. Sac.*

what Prophet it was who foretold that the *Messiah* should be called a *Nazarene*. St. *John Chrysostome*, who had not observed those words in any of the Prophets, did believe, (k) that we ought not to involve our selves in the trouble of an endless search, because there have been several Books of the Prophets lost, which may be proved (as he says) by the History of the Chronicles. The Author of the *Imperfect Work* on St. *Matthew*, does observe, that the Evangelist does not say, (l) *per Prophetam*, by a Prophet, but *per Prophetas*, by the Prophets; to signify, that he did not mean the testimony of any Prophet in particular, but only, that it might be gathered from the Prophets in general. He adds afterwards, that there were probably at that time, other Prophetical Books; which were not placed in the Canon of the Sacred Writings. The ground of this Answer seems to be, that St. *Jerome* has in his Works, made mention of some other Prophetical Books than those we have at this day, and which were read by the *Nazarene* Sectaries, who came from the first Christians of *Jerusalem*, who were also called *Nazarenes*, for whom St. *Matthew* writ his Gospel.

Nevertheless that Father had no recourse to this solution, in his Commentaries upon this place, where he plainly affirms the same thing with the Author of the *Imperfect Work*, viz. That St. *Matthew* (m) having cited the Prophets in general, intended to shew, that he made no mention of the words of any one in particular, but only of the sense: But seeing the word *Nazarene* does signify *Holy*, the Scripture does declare throughout, that the Lord should be *Holy*. He does yet subjoyn another more particular explication, and which appeared to be more probable, as being founded on a Passage of the Prophet *Esay*, Chap. 11. v. 1. (n) *And there shall come forth a Rod out of the Stem of Jesse, and a Nazarene* (vulg. Branch) *shall grow out of his Roots*. I make no Question, but that the *Jews* will condemn this Translation of the words of *Esay*, as well as St. *Mat-*

(k) Καὶ πῶς ὁ σερήνης τὸτο εἶπε μὴ θεωρεῖν, μὲν πολὺ θεωρεῖν πολλὰ καὶ ὅς ὁ σερήνης ὑπάνισται βιβλίων· καὶ ταῦτα ἐν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ παραλειπομένων ἴδοι τις αὐτὸν. Chryl. Hom. 9. in Matth.

(l) Dum dicit *per Prophetas*, non *per Prophetam*, manifestat quoddam non certam auctoritatem Prophetarum protulerit, sed sensum Prophetarum colligens dixit, aut forte legerunt alios Prophetas ita dicentes qui non sunt nobis canonizati. Auct. Op. imp. in c. 2. Matth.

(m) Pluraliter Prophetas vocans ostendit se non verba de Scripturis sumpsisse, sed sensum. Nazareus sanctus interpretatur. Sanctum autem Dominum futurum omnis Scriptura commemorat. Hieron. lib. 1. Comm. in Matth. c. 2.

(n) Possumus & aliter dicere, quod etiam ejusdem verbis juxta Hebraicam veritatem in *Esaia* scriptum sit, *Exiet virga de radice Jesse, & Nazareus de radice ejus ascendet*. Hieron. ibid.

thew's

*t*he *Hebrew*'s citation, because it is not in the *Hebrew*, *Nazarens*, *Nazarene*, as *St. Jerome* has rendred it, but *netser*, which does signifie a flower; as he himself had expounded it in the Version of that Prophet. He likewise observed in his Commentary upon this place of *Esay*, that the *Hebrew* word which does signifie *Nazarene*, is written with the letter *zain*, and that in this place, it is written with a *ʔ tsade*, where it does signifie a flower.

This critical Observation of *St. Jerome*, upon the 11. Chap. of the Prophet *Esay*, seems to destroy what he had observed in his Commentary upon the 2. Chap. of *St. Matthew*: The truth is, 'twas the custom of that Learned Father, in his Commentaries upon the Scripture, rather to report that which he had read in other Commentators, than to establish an opinion of his own. And therefore, 'tis not surprising if we sometimes do find opposite opinions therein: Nevertheless his Learning does afford us great help, for finding out the sense of the most difficult Passages of the Sacred Writings. The Opinion of those who believed that *St. Matthew*, in that place, had cited the Passage of Chap. 11. of the Prophet *Esay*, seems, in my opinion to be the most probable. 'Tis very likely, that *St. Jerome* did apply it to the *Nazarenes*, when he says, in his Commentary upon that Prophet, that the Learned amongst the *Jews* took it from that place: *Eruditi Hebræorum de hoc loco assumptum putant*. Those *Hebrews* are the Sect of the *Nazarenes*, who were called *Hebrews*, and who were so in effect: Seeing they read the Gospel of *St. Matthew* in the *Chaldee* or *Syriack*, the allusion to the *Hebrew* word *netser*, that is in *Esay*, is better known in their Copy than in the *Greek*; and it was also better perceived by those who had the *Hebrew* and *Chaldaick* Languages.

That we make a right judgment hereof, that Passage of *St. Matthew* ought to be read in the *Syriack* Version, which in that place, should not differ from the Original *Chaldee* of *St. Matthew*: But the *Syrians* do read these two words, *Nazareth* and *Nazarene* alike, with the letter *ʔ tsade*. And after this manner they ought in effect, to be read in *St. Matthew*; who intended not to signifie the *Nazarites* of the Old Testament, whose name is written with a *zain*. He made a bare allusion, according to the method of that time, to the *Hebrew* word *netser* of *Esay*, which does signifie a flower, and which is written with a *ʔ tsade*, as well as that of the City *Nazareth*. 'Tis of importance carefully to observe, that the *Jews* do agree with the Christians; that that Passage of *Esay*, which speaks of that flower, called in *Hebrew* *netser*, is understood of the *Messiah*. Which being known at that time to all the World, *St. Matthew*, (who wrote in the *Chaldee*, for the *Jews* of *Jerusalem* then newly converted, who were

were accustomed to expositions of that nature) made an allusion to this *Hebrew* word *netser* or *flower*.

'Tis but consulting the *Jewish Talmud*, their Book entitled *Zohar*, and their Ancient *Medraschim*, or Allegorical Commentaries; for we may there find the like Interpretations of Scripture to be extant, founded on bare allusions, and similitudes, not only of words, but even of letters. If the *Jews* could but seriously reflect on all these considerations, they would not brand, with the title of either false or ridiculous, the citation of St. *Matthew*; who has (say they) perverted the words of the Prophet *Esaï*, to apply them to their *Messiah*. For, seeing that Evangelist, writing for *Jews* who were inclining to embrace the Religion of Jesus Christ, did follow the custom and usage that obtained at that time amongst them: Unless we go back to that ancient custom; we shall meet with great difficulties in the most part of the Passages of the Old Testament, which the Evangelists and Apostles have cited in their Writings, for the confirmation of their own Sentiments.

Apud
Cyril. lib.
7. adv.
Jul.

Apud
Cyril. lib.
8. adv.
Jul.

We ought to pursue this Method, for answering the *Jews* solidly; we are to represent to them the course their Fathers took, which, unless they renounce their Religion, they cannot reject. This Principle also may serve for the refutation of *Julian's* impious charge, who accused the Christians for having abandoned the Law and the Prophets; although they made a profession of following them: He likewise reproached them for their boldness in calling themselves *Israelites*, having (as he alledged) a Doctrin altogether opposite to that of *Moses* and the Ancient Prophets. But it is easie to convince him, that the Christians are truly *Israelites*, since they have neither renounced the Law nor the Prophets, although sometimes they do expound them in a Mystical and Spiritual sense, such an exposition, as has been said, is not contrary to the Doctrin of the Ancient *Jews*.

Aët. c. 3.
v. 22. c.
7. v. 37.

That Emperor, seeing he owned no other sense of the Books of *Moses*, but an Historical and Literal, did object against the Christians; that those words of *Deuteronomy*, Chap. 18. v. 15. *The Lord shall raise up a Prophet like unto me*, could not be understood of *Jesus* the Son of *Mary*; seeing *Moses* does expressly speak (o) of a Prophet, who was to be a Man as he was, and not the Son of God. It is true, that St. *Peter* and St. *Stephen* applied to Jesus Christ, that Passage of *Deuteronomy*, which is literally understood of *Joshua*, who was to succeed to *Moses*, and also of other Judges and Prophets,

(o) Περὶ τῆς ἀνάστασης τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν θεῷ. *Julian. apud*
Cyr. ibid.

who have been in the Commonwealth of the *Hebrews*. But if those Judges and Prophets were the Types of the *Messiah*, why does he oppose the application of the same words to him according to a Sublime and Spiritual Sense, of which we have already spoken, seeing the Rabbins do frequently make the like applications.

By the Principles that we have established, it will be very easie to resolve the most part of the other Objections which the *Jews* do raise against the Citations which are found throughout the Books of the New Testament. The Apostles, who did exactly follow the Expositions which were in use in their time, have observed the same method, almost through all their Writings. The *Jews* could not oppose them without destroying their own Principles, and favouring at the same time the *Sadducees*. According to this method St. *Matthew* applyed to St. *John* the words of the Prophet *Esay*, *The voice of one crying in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord*. It is manifest that the Evangelist did, by a *deras*, or Spiritual and Allegorical Sense, Expound that which we ought to understand Literally, and Historically of the returning of the *Jews* from their Captivity out of *Babylon* to *Jerusalem*.

Besides all those observations which serve as Principles for answering the Objections of the *Jews*, and the Emperor *Julian*, this is likewise remarkable, that there are many words in the New Testament, which have a larger Sense than in the Old, which can be only attributed to the Custom of that time, and to a Tradition received amongst the *Jews*. There is nothing in the Books of *Moses*, that does afford us any clear discovery of the state of a future Life, which the *Jews* do call *olam habba*, i. e. *The World to come*, there is no manifest Record in the ancient Law, of a Heaven or a Hell, any more than there is of a Recompence to the Just, and Punishment to the Wicked in that other Life. Neither have they proper words to express those things; they are obliged to make use of Metaphorical terms. The word *Gebenna*, for example, which is taken from the Hebrew *Gebennam*, has quite another Sense in the Books of the Old Testament, than in the New, where it does signifie the Fire of Hell. Which made St. *Jerom* say (p) that he does not find the word *Gebenna* in ancient Books; that Jesus Christ is the first who used it. Yet this does not prove that he was in effect the first that used it in that Sense, as it is in the New Testament; for it was before that time in use amongst the *Jews*, in the same very Sense, and especially amongst the *Pharisees*. St. *Jerom* meant no more than

(p) *Nomen gebennæ in veteribus libris non invenitur, sed primum à Salvatore ponitur.* Hieron. Comm. in Matth.

this, that he did not find it, in the Old Testament, under that signification, although their Paraphraſts, and their moſt ancient Rab- bins uſed it in the ſame Senſe as Jeſus Chriſt did afterwards.

The *Hebrew* word *Sceol* will come under the ſame conſideration, for in the *Hebrew* of the Old Teſtament, it does ſignifie a Sepulchre; it is almoſt every where in the Septuagint, rendred *Idm, Hell*, as if they had frequently intended to ſignifie by that word, a ſubterranean place, where Souls are after their ſeparation from the Body. St. Peter in the Acts of the Apoſtles, does Expound of the *Meſſiah*, according to that Senſe, the words of Pſalm xv. *Thou wilt not leave my ſoul in hell, nor ſuffer thy holy one to ſee corruption.* Which Paſſage is Literally underſtood of David, who ſaid to God that he would not ſuffer his Enemies to take away his Life; and thus the *Hebrew* words *Sceol* and *Scabat*, according to the former Senſe, do ſignifie Literally a Sepulchre, and a Ditch. But according to the Spiritual and Myſtical Senſe, which St. Peter gives to this Pſalm that he applies to the *Meſſiah*, whoſe Type David was, the *Greek* words *Idm* and *diapnoez* which he took from the ancient Verſion of the Septuagint, do ſignifie in the Acts of the Apoſtles, Hell and Corruption. The Application that the Apoſtle made of the words of that Pſalm, to the Reſurrection of the *Meſſiah*; does contain nothing but what is agreeable to the belief of the *Jews* of that time, who believed the Reſurrection of the dead. They further acknowledged a ſubterranean place, to which Souls do go after their ſeparation from the Body. Without a due regard to all theſe conſiderations, it is impoſſible to underſtand the New Teſtament.

Therefore it is to be ſuppoſed as a thing conſtantly agreed upon, that the *Jews*, in the time of our Saviour and the Apoſtles, believed many things, whereof they had no Literal proofs in all the Old Teſtament, being only founded on their Traditions. And the Writings of the Evangelists and the Apoſtles, ought to be Expounded with a relation to this *Idea* of the *Jewiſh* Faith, and not to that which may be conceived of their belief, with a reference to the Books of the Old Teſtament only; becauſe thoſe Books contain but one part of their Religion, the other part being comprehended in their Traditions. The *Jews* do own this Principle. The *Jews*, even the *Caraites*, who do mightily oppoſe the Traditions of the *Talmudiſts*, which had degenerated into Fables, have preſerved thoſe which they believed to be founded on ſufficient Records.

The ancient Hereticks, who did not weigh all theſe conſiderations, did rather chooſe to deny the truth of the Books of the New Teſtament, and ſay, that in after times there were interpolations made therein, than to attribute to the Apoſtles ſuch things as they did not underſtand.

It

It is upon this supposed ground that the *Manichees*, (who found no express Passages in the Law of *Moses*, that made mention of Jesus Christ,) rejected as false, all those Places of the *Pentateuch*, that were applied to him in the New Testament. They did not consider that at the time of Christ and the Apostles, there was a Mystical and Spiritual Sense approved of by all the *Jews*, some *Sadducees* possibly excepted. And with respect to this Sense, the Writings of the Evangelists and the Apostles are to be Expounded.

And therefore they deceive themselves, who pretend that there ought to be a Literal Sense in all the Citations of the Apostles, especially in those which they bring in for Proofs. It is true, that a Passage of Scripture taken Allegorically, cannot serve for a Proof; but we speak here of such Allegorical Senses as were received, and which were also founded on Traditions that were warranted by Authority. They were therefore permitted to apply them to their Discourse, and likewise to draw such Consequences from them as might promote their design, in the same manner as the *Pharisees* made use of them in their Disputes against the *Sadducees*. Those Allegorical Senses prove nothing for their own confirmation, but suppose a belief already established, upon which they were founded.

It is probable that *Theodore de Mopsueste*, Expounded the Psalms and the Prophecies according to this Method, and that he had regard to nothing, when he was condemned as a favourer of the *Jews*, but the Literal and Historical Sense, which he gave to those ancient Prophecies. They will not consider the Application he made thereof, with the whole Church, to the *Messiah*, according to a Spiritual and Mystical Sense. If we believe *Facundus*, there is no justice done to that great Man, who had a perfect knowledge of the Sacred Writings. (q) They accused him of destroying the Prophecies that related to Jesus Christ, by an error like to that of the *Manichees*. But he shews the falshood of this accusation, by producing the very words of *Theodore*, taken out of his Commentaries upon the Psalms. *Quod autem* (saith *Facundus*) *nec evacuet omnes in Christum prophetias palam est quia rursus in ejusdem Psalmi expositione dicit, &c.* Whence he concludes, (r) That it was hard to make *Theodore* pass for an impious person, who believed with the *Jews* that Jesus Christ was a mere Man, seeing he vigorously defended the contrary. This is no place to inquire if *Theodore* was unjustly condemned, as *Facundus*

(q) *Eum dicunt evacuassee omnes in Christum factas Prophetias, quod Manicheorum erroris est.* Fac. pro def. tri. cap. Conc. Calc. lib. 9. c. 1.

(r) *Non ergo Theodorus Judaica impietate arguendus est, tanquam hominem putaverit Christum, cum potius Judaeis irrideat.* Fac. ibid.

does assure us. I have only made mention of the Passage that I might shew, that great Men have of a long time acknowledged two Senses of Scripture, as we have already made evident.

It is certain that the Christian Religion is founded on that of the *Jews*. The Christians have this in common with them, that they adore the same God, and that they believe a *Messiah* promised in the Writings of the Old Testament; which they receive equally. And therefore the Christians who Expound those Writings in a Literal and Historical Sense, cannot be blamed, as if they favoured *Judaism*, in exclusion of the Christian Religion, seeing they acknowledged a second Sense, called Spiritual and Mystical, which they apply to the *Messiah*. This latter Sense is the same that the *Jews* call *deras*. In a word, it is impossible to arrive at a perfect knowledge of the Christian Religion, and the Principles upon which it is established, so long as that of the *Jews* is not known, to which the former does owe its Original.

Celsus, *Porphyrius*, *Julian*, and the *Jews* have brought some other Objections against the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles. The Principal is that which is drawn from the Genealogy of Jesus Christ, Recorded in a different manner by St. *Matthew* and St. *Luke*. They alledge, that besides that these two Evangelists do not agree, they have delivered manifest falsities. But this aspersions has been so clearly wiped off, by many Commentators upon the New Testament, and also in the Volumes that purposely have been written for that end, that it is needless to insist on it. I shall only observe in general, that it is easie to make answer to the *Jews*, upon such objections as are drawn from Genealogies. When they bring against the Christians, the difference that is betwixt our Evangelists and the Books of the Old Testament, their Mouths will be stopped, if we shew them, that there is no less in this matter betwixt the Chronicles, which they attribute to *Esdras*, and the rest of the Historical Writings of the Old Testament. Their Rabbins, who could not reconcile things that appeared so remote from one another, are forced to own, that the same Genealogies, which are written in a different manner, were taken out of Records that did likewise differ. And may not we also affirm, that the Evangelists Collected the Genealogy of Jesus Christ out of such Records as were amongst the *Jews* at that time, but are not extant at this day? And therefore, it is better to leave the things as they are, than to judg rashly of them, or correct that Genealogy upon bare conjectures.

CHAP. XXIII.

Of the Inspiration of the Books of the New Testament. A Refutation of the Opinion of Grotius and Spinoza. The Cardinal of Perron has given a very bad Exposition of the Words of the second Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, Chap. 3. v. 16. which makes mention of this Inspiration. The Disputes betwixt the Jesuits of Louvain, and the Divines of the same place, upon this matter. Three Propositions of the Jesuits Censured by the Doctors of Louvain and Douay. A Defence of those Propositions against the Censure of those Divines.

I Have Treated elsewhere of the Inspiration of the Sacred Writings in general. But seeing I only Treated of them occasionally, and by way of Answer to some Objections which were brought against the Critical History of the Old Testament, I shall here Handle it more particularly, with respect to the Writings of the Evangelists and the Apostles. It is the common Belief of the *Jews*, that the Books of the Old Testament were written by Persons who were Inspired: which Belief was transmitted from the *Jews* to the Christians. Upon which occasion *Origen* affirmed (a) that both the one and the other did equally acknowledge, that the Sacred Scripture was written by the Spirit of God.

The Christians have also extended that Inspiration to the Books of the New Testament. There are but very few Criticks who are of the Opinion, that there is nothing of Inspiration in Scripture, but only in that part of it that was Composed by the Prophets. They say the Historical Books were not inspired, because (as they alledge) it is not necessary for him that writes History, to be a Prophet. *Grotius* is of that Opinion, in his Book Entituled, *Votum pro pace Ec-*

(a) τὰ βιβλία διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμολογούμενα ἀμώβηται. Orig. lib. 3. cont. Cels.

clerical; (b) If St. Luke, (saith that Critick) had been Inspired by God, when he writ his History, he would rather have made use of that Inspiration, by the example of the Prophets, than the Authority of those whom he takes for Witnesses of his faithfulness. He had no need, (he further says) of any Inspiration for writing the Actions of St. Paul, of which he himself was a Witness. Whence he does conclude, that the Writings of St. Luke are Canonical, not because they were Inspired, but because the Primitive Church did Judge that they were written by godly Men, with great faithfulness, and Treat of things that are of very great importance to our Salvation. He does repeat the same thing elsewhere, in his Works against Rivetus, who opposed that Opinion as being impious. He does there affirm, (c) that Esdras and St. Luke were not Prophets, but Grave and Prudent Men, who would neither deceive others, nor be deceived themselves. He does further affirm, That St. Luke does not say in the Prophetical Stile, *The word of the Lord came unto Luke*, that the Lord did not say to him, *Write*.

Spinosa did exactly follow the Opinion of Grotius; which he has explained more at large in his Book, Entituled *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*; where he does not indeed deny, but that the Apostles were Prophets, but he affirms (d) that it may be doubted, if they writ their Books in the quality of Prophets, by the express command of God inspiring them, as Moses, Jeremy, and others had done. He does alledge, that (e) if we judge of the Works of the Apostles by their Stile, we shall find that they writ as particular Doctors, and not as Prophets, because they have nothing that is Prophetical. Which

(b) Si Lucas divino afflatu dictante sua scripsisset, inde potius sibi sumpsisset auctoritatem, ut Prophetæ faciunt, quam à testibus quorum fidem est secutus. Sic in iis quæ Paulum agentem vidit scribendis nullo ipsi dictante afflatu opus. Quid ergo est cur Lucæ libri sint canonici? Quia pie & fideliter scriptos, & de rebus momenti ad salutem maximi Ecclesiæ primorum temporum judicavit. Grot. Not. pro Pac. Eccl. tit. de Can. Script.

(c) Neque Esdras neque Lucas Prophetæ fuere, sed viri graves & prudentes, qui nec fallere vellent, nec falli se sinerent. Dixitne Lucas, Factum est ad Lucam verbum Domini; & dixit ei Dominus, Scribe? Grot. Riv. Apolog. discuss. pag. 723.

(d) Dubitare possumus num Apostoli tanquam Prophetæ ex revelatione & expresso mandato, ut Moses, Jeremias & alii, an verò ut privati, vel Doctores, Epistolas scripserint. Spin. Tract. Theol. polit. c. 11.

(e) Si ad eorum stilum attendere volumus, eum à stilo Prophetiæ alienissimum inveniemus. Nam Prophetis usitatissimum erat ubique testari se ex Dei edicto loqui, nempe, Sic dicit Deus, Ait Deus exercituum, Edictum Dei, &c. Atque hoc non tantum videtur locum habuisse in publicis Prophetarum concionibus, sed etiam in Epistolis quæ revelationes continebant. Spin. ibid.

he does prove by the same way of reasoning, as *Grotius*. It is (saith he) the custom of the Prophets, to declare through all their Writings, that they spake by God's order; and they have observed that, not only in their Prophecies, but in their Letters which contain revelations.

This Opinion of *Grotius* and *Spinosa*, has been lately renewed in two Letters, Published in a Treatise, Entitled, *The Opinions of some Divines of Holland upon the Critical History of the Old Testament*. Seeing I have given a sufficient Answer to those two Letters, and also to the new Explications thereof, which have been since published; 'tis to no purpose to repeat here what has been said elsewhere: We shall only observe in general, that those Men do deceive themselves, whilst they will not own any Inspiration, but that of the Prophecies. It is true, that the manner of writing a History, and Letters is not the same as writing Prophecies; And therefore, these words (*The word of God that came to Luke*) do not begin the History of *St. Luke* or any other Evangelist. The Books of *Moses*, *Joshua*, and in a word, all the Historical Books of the Old Testament, are not written in that Stile which *Grotius* does call Prophetical: Yet *Josephus* and all the Ancient *Jews* call them Prophetical, believing that they were given by Divine Inspiration.

'Tis not necessary, for a Book's being inspired, that it should be indited by God, word for word. The false Idea that those Authors have conceived of the Inspiration of the Sacred Writings, made them embrace an opinion which is contrary to all Antiquity, as well Judaical as Christian. Jesus Christ, who promised to his Apostles, that the Spirit of God should guide them in all the functions of their Ministry, did not therefore, deprive them of their Reason and Memory: Although they were inspired, they continued to be Men still, and managed their Affairs as other Men. I freely own, that there was no need of Inspiration, to put in record such matters of Fact, whereof they themselves were Witnesses. But this does not hinder, but that they were directed by the Spirit of God in all that they put in Writing, so as not to fall into error.

It is certain, that all the Ancient Ecclesiastical Writers did acknowledge this Inspiration of the Evangelists and Apostles. Nevertheless they speak of their care, and exactness in penning their Works, in the same manner, as they speak of other Writers, who are not inspired. Can *Grotius* conclude from thence, that those Ancient Doctors of the Church did not believe, that the Books of the New Testament were given by Divine Inspirations. This he cannot do, seeing those very Doctors have clearly maintained it. We need but call to mind what has been said in the 10th Chap. concern-

cerning the Opinion of *Papias*, who was contemporary with the Disciples of the Apostles: He does assure us, that if that Evangelist, did not observe in his History, the order of things as to their Event, that he was not in the least to be blamed for that; because he made mention of the things according as he remembred them, not being so careful to relate them in their order, as he was, to say nothing but what was Truth. *Papias*, or rather one of the Disciples of the Apostles, (whose words *Papias* does produce in that place) did not thereby pretend to reject the Inspiration of the Gospel of St. *Mark*. We need but consult the other Ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, who expressed themselves in such a manner, as might oblige *Grotius* and *Spinosa* to believe, that they owned no Inspiration in the Books of the New Testament, if they had not expressly maintained it in other places of their Works.

II. Epist.
ad Tim.
c. 3. v. 16.

That which, amongst Christians does most of all confirm the Inspiration of the Sacred Writings; is the strong Foundation that the Apostle *Paul* has in one of his Epistles to *Timothy*, *all Scripture is given by Divine Inspiration*. We have elsewhere refuted all the subtil allegations that were brought by *Grotius*, who endeavoured to the utmost of his power, to put quite another sense on that Passage. But I made it most manifest, that that able Critick was to be blamed, on many accounts, in attempting to wrest the interpretation of those words of St. *Paul*, that he might accommodate them to his own Idea's.

Answ. to
the Def. of
some Holl.
Div. c. 10.

It is surprizing, that the Cardinal of *Perron*, who was perswaded of the Inspiration of the Holy Scripture, should nevertheless have made his strongest efforts, for depriving Christians of this proof of Inspiration. It is customary amongst those who write Books of Controversie, to think of nothing, but answering the Objections of their Adversaries, without examining the proper and natural sense of the Passages of Scripture, for the confirmation of their own Opinions. He followed this Method of Polemical Authors, in his Answer to the King of Great Britain: Seeing the Protestants forget nothing, that may recommend the Authority of the Scripture alone; without the aid of Traditions, *du Perron* likewise, for his part, forgot nothing that might enhance the Authority of Traditions. The Protestants did object to him those words of the Apostle *Paul*, *All Scripture is given by Divine Inspiration, and is profitable for Doctrine*. Thus in effect, that place of St. *Paul* to *Timothy* ought to be rendred; nevertheless he does loudly oppose this Translation, under a pretence, that there is not the word *ἅπα, tota, all or the whole*, in the Greek, but *ἅπαν, omnis, all or every*; and that we do not read with the Article, *ἅπαν ἡ γραφή, all the Scripture*, but without the Article, *ἅπαν γραφή, all*
To

II. Epist.
ad Tim.
c. 3. v. 16.

Du Perr.
lib. 3. de
Trad.
Apost. c. 4.

To what purpose are all those niceties of Grammar and Dialect, which the Cardinal does use in that place? It is true, that he does alledge the Authority of St. *John Chrysostome*, *Theodoret* and some other Fathers, for the confirmation of his Opinion. But I desire no other testimony but theirs, to bring it under condemnation: And to avoid being tedious, in a thing so easie to be justified, seeing the Works of those Fathers are every where to be had, it will suffice, if we inform our selves of St. *Jerome's* thoughts in the case; he is of a quite different Opinion from that which the Cardinal has Father'd on him. That Learned Bishop does not say, with the Cardinal, that that Passage ought to be understood, *distributively*, by translating it, *all Scripture*, and not *collectively*, by translating it, *all the Scripture*: He does on the contrary, assure us in his Homily, upon those words of St. *Paul*, that that Holy Apostle does speak of *all the Holy Scripture*, which *Timothy* had studied from his Infancy; and he concludes, that *all that Scripture* is profitable, and given by the Inspiration of God. Πᾶσα ἡ ἡμεῖς ἀπολαύμεθα καὶ σπουδάσωμεθα. But by the Scripture that is spoken of in that place, it is evident that we must understand all the Old Testament.

*Chrysost.
Hom. 9. in
Ep. II. ad
Tim.*

It is in no wise likely, that *du Perron* himself had read St. *John Chrysostome's* Homily, or any other of the Greek Fathers whom he cites. That which deceived those who read them for him, and gave him an abstract of their pretended sentiments, is, that they consulted only the Latin Version of that Homily, where it is, according to the vulgar Translation, *Omnis Scriptura divinitus inspirata est utilis*, i. e. *All Scripture that is given by the Inspiration of God is profitable*. But it was shewn elsewhere, that in the ancient vulgar, it was *Inspirata & utilis* i. e. *is inspired and profitable*; as it is in the Greek, and that we are to expound that Passage *collectively* and not *distributively*.

We may nevertheless, very well give that sense also to the vulgar, as the rendition is at this day; according to that reading the Translation will be, *All the Scripture which was given by Inspiration is profitable*, and not with *Amelote*, and with the Authors of the *Mons* Translation, *All Scripture that has been given by Divine Inspiration, is profitable*. The *Syriack*, *Arabick*, and *Ethiopic* Versions, which that Cardinal pretends to be favourable to him, have quite another sense than what he does attribute to them, as I have shewn, in the Answer to the Defence of the Opinions of some Holland Divines, concerning the Critical History of the Old Testament.

*Ans. to
the Def.
of the Op.
Ch. 10.*

But to proceed, I do not comprehend, why the Cardinal *du Perron* does dispute with so much vigour about the manner of Translating that Passage of St. *Paul*, and that from thence he does infer, that

that if it prove any thing, it *must be*, that every Canonical Writing was sufficient, by it self, for universal instruction in all the Christian Religion. The word *πᾶσι* (saith he) without an Article, does denote every piece of the Holy Scripture, distributively. But the Greek Fathers did not wire-draw St. Paul's words after that manner, but did expound them, as if in effect, they had read *πᾶσι ἡ γράφη*, all the Scripture, with the Article. The Catholicks ought also to agree with the Protestants, that all the Scripture is profitable for instruction: which does not at all exclude Traditions, which being joyned to Scripture, does compose the Principle upon which the Christian Religion is Founded: And therefore there is nothing but subtilty in all the Cardinal's dispute, who would pass his refined impertinencies for a Comment on those words of the Apostle; and who bids defiance, in that adventure to all Antiquity.

Estius on the contrary, has allowed too large a sense to the same Passage. He has indeed, interpreted the Vulgar very well, according to the Greek Text; from which the Latin was taken. But he went beyond the sense, (f) when he did conclude from thence, that all the Holy Scripture was indited by the Spirit of God, not only as to the matter, or things therein contained, but also in respect of the words and all their circumstances; so as there is no word in Scripture, nor any order by ranging of words, but what comes from God. This Opinion is very little agreeable to the Doctrine of the Ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, who seemed not to have stretched that Inspiration beyond the things themselves. But *Estius*, who taught Theology in the University of *Douay*, was obliged to speak the Language of the Divines of that place, who had made a Decree, upon that matter, against the Fathers, the Jesuits of *Louvain*, who had set out some propositions directly opposite thereunto. Besides, *Estius* was the Principal Author of the censure to which those propositions were exposed. We shall give here a full account of the difference, that happened between those Doctors of *Louvain* and *Douay*, and the Jesuits of the Colledge of *Louvain* about the Point of Inspiration.

It is not of late, that the Divines, who make profession of following St. *Augustine* in their Schools and Books, have opposed the Theology of the Fathers the Jesuits. Those Fathers having an 1586. maintained in their Colledge of *Louvain* some Propositions upon

(f) Rectè igitur & verissimè ex hoc loco statuitur, omnem Scripturam Sacram & Canonicam Spiritu Sancto dictante esse conscriptam; ita nimirum, ut non solum sententia, sed & verba singula & verborum ordo ac tota dispositio sit à Deo tanquam per semetipsum loquente. Est. Comm. in Epist. II. ad Timot. c. 3. v. 16.

the Subject of Grace, Predestination and the Holy Scripture, which appeared new to the Doctors of *Louvain* and *Douay*; these Doctors did censure them, and withal published the reasons of their censure: Seeing we do not speak in this place, of Grace and Predestination, but only of the Holy Scripture, I shall insist on such things only as concern the Scripture. You may take a view of the Title of the Censure issued out by the Divines of *Louvain*, as it was Printed at *Paris*, at the end of a Book entitled, *Florentii Conrii Peregrinus Ferichuntinus, Censura Facultatum Sacrae Theologiae Lovaniensis ac Duacensis super quibusdam Articulis de Sacra Scriptura, &c. anno Domini 1586. Scripto traditis.* The Censure is directed to all the Body of the Jesuits of *Louvain*, in these Terms; *Reverendis in Christo Patribus, Patri Rectori ac Professoribus cæterisque Patribus Collegii Societatis nominis Jesu in Universitate Lovaniensi, Decanus & reliqui Facultatis in eadem Universitate Magistri, æternam salutem pacemque precamur.*

Those Wise Masters, whilst they declared against the Jesuits a War that was never to have an end, do not fail to wish them eternal Peace: They call their Doctrin, strange, scandalous and dangerous, *peregrina, offensiva & periculosa dogmata.* Amongst the Propositions which they censured, there are three which run thus. (g)
 1. That a thing should be Holy Scripture, it is not necessary that all the words thereof should be inspired by God. 2. It is not necessary for all Truths and Sentences, to be immediatly indited by Inspiration to the Writer. 3. A Book, as for example, the second of the *Maccabees*, which was written by Men only without the assistance of the Holy Ghost, does afterwards become Holy Scripture, if the Holy Spirit doth testify that there is nothing that is false, in that Book.

These three Propositions were extracted out of the Writings of the Fathers the Jesuits, who taught Theology in the College of *Louvain*; and they were so far from condemning them, upon a remonstrance made to them, that they were scandalous, that they freely defended them, adding thereunto new explications: *ab iisdem ibidem Professoribus pro suis agnitæ, comprobatae, scholiisque illustratae.* They appeared to be really agreeable to good sense, neither do they much vary from the Theology of the Ancient Fathers, whom we are

(g) *Ut aliquid sit Scriptura Sacra, non est necessarium singula ejus verba inspirata esse à Spiritu Sancto. II. Non est necessarium ut singula veritates & sententia sint immediatè à Spiritu Sancto ipsi scriptori inspiratae. III. Liber aliquis, qualis fortasse est secundus Maccabæorum, humanâ industriâ sine assistentiâ Spiritus Sancti scriptus, si Spiritus Sanctus postea testetur ibi nihil esse falsum, efficitur Scriptura Sacra.* Jesuit. Colleg. Lovan. assert. apud Flor. Contr.

more bound to hear, upon this Subject, than the *Sacred Faculty of Theology of Louvain*; who, in condemning them as they did, were guilty of a great act of injustice against the Society of the Jesuits: The words of the Censure, as to their purport, are (b) that those three Assertions, did come near to the ancient Heresie of the *Anomæans*, who were of Opinion, that the Prophets and the Apostles had frequently spoken, as other private Men, and to the sentiments of those, of whom St. *Jerome* makes mention, in the Preface of his Commentaries upon the Epistle of St. *Paul* to *Philemon*; which Opinion was censured in the Person of *Erasmus*. They do further oppose to those Assertions, the Council of *Trent*, the words of St. *Peter*, in his second Epistle; of St. *Paul*, in his second Epistle to *Timothy*, and finally, the Authority of the Ancient Fathers; who assure us, that the Tongue and Hand of the Holy Writers, were made use of as a Pen by the Holy Ghost.

Before we enter upon a discussion of what concerns the Divines of *Louvain*, we shall relate the Censure of the Faculty of Theology of *Douay*. These Divines declare, that they have examined the Propositions of the Jesuits, by the Order of the Archbishops of *Cambray* and of *Malines*, and of the Bishop of *Gand*: They do not condemn them in gross, as the Doctors of *Louvain* had done, but they apply their Censure to each Proposition in particular. To the two first they oppose St. *Augustine*, who did (according to their Opinion) believe, that the Sacred Writers received from God, a particular faculty and method of delivering and composing their discourse. They do also quote *Gabriel* a Scholastick Divine; who affirmed, that the Apostles were Inspired with many natural Truths, and that a Book might be inspired, although there be pains and meditation used in its composition. Those Divines do likewise give for an Example, Jesus Christ, (i) who (say they) if he had written any Book, might as a Man have meditated, and applied himself to that Work, although his Spirit, his Mouth, his Tongue, his Hands, and his Fingers would continually have been the Instruments of the Holy Ghost. And thus the Doctors of *Douay* do endeavour to destroy the Propositions

(h) Tres ille assertiones accedere videntur ad damnatam olim Anomæorum opinionem, qui Prophetas & Apostolos in multis volebant ut homines fuisse locutos, ut refert Epiphanius, Hæresi 76. & ad eorum sententiam quam præfatione in Epistolam ad Philemonem & alibi Hieronymus reprehendit, de qua & notatus Erasmus fuit. Cens. Fac. Theol. Lovan.

(i) Si scribere voluisset, laborem nonnunquam & meditationem simulque industriam aliquam adhibere potuit humanam, quamvis interim spiritus ejus humanus, itemque os, lingua, manus, digiti perpetua quædam essent instrumenta Divini Spiritus. Cens. Theol. Duac.

of the Jesuits of *Louvain*, which to them appeared to be scandalous: And also under a pretence of shewing, that they subvert all Religion, in speaking to the second Proposition, they add, that (k) if it be once granted, that it is not necessary, that every Truth and Sentence should be immediatly indited by the Spirit of God; there will be endless disputes, not only about that which is particularly delivered in Scripture by immediate Inspiration, but also about entire Gospels, the History of which may be known in a humane manner: It will be also question'd, in general, if all the Books of the Scripture that are not Prophetical, have been immediatly suggested by the Holy Ghost, to those who were the Writers thereof.

The third Proposition appeared to those Divines, to be the most dangerous of all, and opposite to the words of *St. Paul*, who does assure us, that all the Scripture is given by the Inspiration of God, and a Divine Doctrin, which was indited by the Holy Spirit. It is for this Reason, (say they) that the Decrees of Popes and of Councils, were never reckoned in the number of Divine Writings; although the Holy Ghost does testify by the Church, that there is nothing that is false in those Decrees. And finally they add, that that third Proposition of the Jesuits of *Louvain* could not be maintained, without acknowledging, that the Histories of *Thucydides*, and of *Livie*, might for the same reason be reckoned amongst the Books of the Scripture; if the Holy Ghost should testify to us, that there is nothing of falshood in those Histories. They conclude their Censure with this Maxim: (l) That a thing is not therefore given by Divine Inspiration; because it so falls out, that it is approved of afterwards; but that, on the contrary, it is approved, because it was Inspired. Let us now see, if the Doctors of the two Faculties of Theology had reason to condemn those three Propositions, in terms that are injurious to the Society of the Jesuits.

'Tis observable, that before all these things, the Jesuits, who published at *Rome*, an. 1586. a Directory for the Studies of their Society, Entitled, *Ratio Studiorum*, have placed this Proposition concerning the Inspiration of the Sacred Writings, amongst those which

(k) Si non est necessarium ut singula veritates & sententiae quae sunt in Sacris Literis immediate sint à Spiritu Sancto ipsi scriptori inspiratae, non modo sequetur indeterminabilis altercatio super sententiis immediate vel non immediate inspiratis, verum etiam de integris Evangelis, quorum historia potuit humanitus esse nota; imò & de omnibus Scripturis non Propheticis dubitabitur, an immediate Spiritus Sanctus eas scriptoribus inspiraverit. Theol. Duac. ibid.

(l) Non enim ideo inspiratum aliquid divinitus est, quòd postea sit approbatum; sed ideo est approbatum, quia fuerat divinitus inspiratum. ibid.

their Divines ought to prefer to others : (m) *It is more probable* (say they) *that the first and Original Copies, which were not corrupted, were all particularly indited by the Holy Ghost, as to what concerns the substance, but in a different manner according to the different condition of the Instruments.*

By that we see, that the Jesuits of Rome did not believe at that time, that the same Inspiration is to be acknowledged in all the Books of the Scripture ; and when they say, that every word was Inspired, they add withal, *as to what concerns the Substance.* Besides, they do not maintain this Inspiration of words, as to what belongs to the substance, but as a probable Opinion ; so that they believe, that that may be also denied with probability. It is true, that the Opinion of those two Faculties of Theology, belonging to *Louvain* and *Douay*, was then most received in the Schools. But the Jesuits, who from that time, have had Learned Men in their Society, saw very well, that it was contradictory to good sense ; and likewise opposite to the most Ancient Doctors of the Church. Those of their College of *Louvain*, did nothing that was contrary to the Rule or Constitution of their Foundation ; which (n) does expressly forbid the *introducing of new Opinions*, for the same rule does proceed, *unless it be done with the consent of the Superiors.*

There is nothing more judicious, than the Liberty of Opinion, which is granted by the Constitutions of that Society to its Professors, in the manner as it is limited. (o) Father Ignatius did ordain, that in every Science whatsoever, they should follow the most certain and the most received Doctrine. But seeing it is not easie to distinguish, what are the most certain and the most received Opinions ; he decreed, that the choice should depend on the Rector, who ought to embrace, for the greater Glory of God, that which was maintained in the whole Society.

And the truth is, the Jesuits did no sooner appear in the World,

(m) *Probabilius est verba primorum exemplarium ac fontium incorruptorum fuisse omnia & singula à Spiritu Sancto dictata secundum substantiam, multiformiter tamen pro variâ instrumentorum conditione.* Rat. stud. edit. Rom. tit. de reliq. opin. del. in Theol. fac.

(n) *Fundator constitutionum, 3. part. c. 10. disertis verbis cavet ne novæ opiniones admittantur. Quod tamen ut suavius fieret additum est, hæc formulâ, nisi ex consensu præpositorum.* Rat. stud. tit. de del. opin.

(o) *Sequantur, ait Ignatius, in quavis facultate securiorem & magis approbatam doctrinam, & eos auctores qui eam docent. Et ne singulis liberum esset judicium de magis approbatâ & securiore doctrinâ deligendâ, statim subdit, Cujus rei penes Rectorem, qui quod statueretur in universâ Societate ad majorem Dei gloriam secururus est, cura sit.* ibid.

but there was a birth given to much more considerable assistances, for the study of Theology, than had ever been before that time. And therefore they did wisely, that they were not altogether devoted to the Opinions of *St. Thomas*, and *St. Augustin*, though they were zealously embraced in the most part of the Universities at that time. They had reason in that case, not to follow blindly the Opinions that were most received in the Schools in their time, concerning the Inspiration of the Sacred Writings. This liberty of Propheſie, which had been agreed upon, in behalf of their Professors of Theology, did afford them an occasion of making new discoveries in this Science: and to this I impute the rigor with which the Jesuits of *Louvain* maintain their Opinions about Inspiration, without troubling themselves about the Belief of the two Faculties of Theology of *Louvain* and *Douay*, who had not carefully enough examined that matter.

Notwithstanding the Censures of those two Faculties, they continued to teach, in their College of *Louvain*, the same Opinions concerning the Inspiration of the Sacred Writings. Father *Cornelius à Lapide*, a few years after that time, kept up, in the same place, publick Lectures on the Holy Scriptures; which he continued for the space of sixteen years. He likewise published those Lectures by the Order of the Archbishop of *Malmes*, and of his Superiors, beginning in his Commentaries with the Epistles of *St. Paul*, which he did Dedicate to the Archbishop. But in the Exposition which he gives of the Passage of that Apostle, where he speaks of the Scriptures being given by the Inspiration of God, he is altogether against *Estius*, who was at the same time Professor in the University of *Douay*. It is manifest, that that Jesuit did insist on that difficulty on purpose, and that he then had an Eye to the Censures of the Divines of *Louvain* and *Douay*. He maintained in his Commentaries upon that place of *St. Paul*, the Propositions which his Doctors had condemned.

Although the Commentaries of *Cornelius à Lapide* may be had every where, it is convenient to set down his own words in this place, by which we may perceive that the Jesuits of *Louvain* did not regard the Censures of the Divines there. (p) *Observe*, (saith that Jesuit,)

(p) *Nota Spiritum Sanctum non eodem modo dictasse omnes Sacras Literas. Nam Legem & Prophetas ad verbum revelavit & dictavit Moſi & Prophetis. Hiſtorias verò & morales exhortationes, quas antea vel viſu, vel auditu, vel lectione, vel meditatione didicerant ipſi ſcriptores hagiographi, non fuit neceſſe inspirari aut dictari à Spiritu Sancto, uipotè cum eas ſcirent aut callerent ipſi ſcriptores. Sic S. Joannes, c. 19. v. 35. dicit ſe ſcribere quæ vidit. S. Lucas verò, c. 1. v. 2. dicit ſe ſcribere Evangelium quod audivit & traditione accepit ab Apoſtoliſ. Cornel. à Lap. Comm. in Epist. II. ad Tim. c. 3. v. 16.*

that

that the Holy Ghost did not indite all the Sacred Writings after the same manner. For he indited the Words of the Law and the Prophets, to Moses and the Prophets. But as to the Histories, and the Exhortations to Piety, which the Holy Pen-Men had learned, by seeing, hearing, reading, or meditation, it was not at all necessary, that they should be Inspired or Indited by the Spirit of God; because those Writers knew such things very well. And thus St. John Chap. xix. 25. does say, that he writ that which he had seen. St. Luke does also declare, Chap. i. 2. That he writ his Gospel, according to what he had learned of the Apostles. All this is manifestly contrary to the Censures of the Doctors of Louvain and Douay. That Jesuit does deliver himself in a clear and distinct manner. He very exquisitely confirms the Opinion of those of his Society, who had taught Theology before him in the College of Louvain.

But seeing it may be objected that this Opinion is the same with that of Grotius and Spinoza, who acknowledged no other Inspiration but that of the Prophetical Writings, it is worth the while to subjoin that which Cornelius à Lapide observed in the same place, concerning the manner of Inspiration that concerns Historical and Moral part of the Holy Scripture. (q) Nevertheless, they affirm (saith he) that these latter Works were also Indited by the Holy Ghost, first, because he did assist the Writers; that they could never be deceived: and again, because he suggested to them, that one thing should be rather written than another. So that the Holy Spirit did not suggest to them either their conceptions, or the remembrance of those things which they knew; but did inspire them in this respect only, that they might put one conception in writing, rather than another. In this, the Inspiration of the Historical, and Moral Writings of the Holy Scripture did consist, according to the Opinion of that learned Jesuit; wherein nothing appears but what is good Sense; whereas in the Opinion of the Doctors of Louvain and Douay, (which is the same with that of the Calvinists) there is something unintelligible, that does violence both to Reason and Experience.

It cannot be said that this Opinion is a Novelty that was unadvisedly asserted by that Jesuit. For he maintained it in the same Schools, where that Dispute had made so great a noise, upon the occasion of some Propositions that were put out upon that Subject, by

(q) Dicitur tamen Spiritus Sanctus ea quoque illis dictasse, primo, quia scribentibus adstiterit, ne vel in puncto à veritate aberrarent: secundo, quia eos excitavit & suggestit, ut hæc potius scriberent quàm illa. Conceptum ergo & memoriam eorum quæ sciebant non eis ingessit Spiritus Sanctus, sed inspiravit ut hunc potius conceptum quàm illum scriberent. Corn. à Lapid. ibid.

some Divines of his Society. He was very much desirous to clear that Question in his Commentaries upon *St. Paul*, to make it appear to all the World, that the Censures of the two Faculties of Theology of *Louvain* and *Douay* had no Foundation, and that they were against Reason. Further, the Provincial of the Jesuits of the *Low-Countries*, who gave his approbation to that Book, does declare that he himself had read it, and had committed it to the Examination of four Divines of his Society. There is also at the beginning of those Commentaries, an Approbation of the Censor of the Books of that place, who is a Canon of *Arras*. But that the World may be intirely satisfied, that there is nothing either scandalous or dangerous, in the Opinion of the Jesuits of the *Low-Countries*, touching the Inspiration of the Sacred Writings, we shall proceed to examin the Reasons upon which the Divines of *Louvain* and of *Douay* did found their Censures.

CHAP. XXIV.

An Examination of the Reasons that the Doctors of Louvain and Douay made use of, in their Censure of the Propositions of the Jesuits of Louvain, touching the Inspiration of the Sacred Writings. A very free Opinion of a Learned Divine of Paris about the same thing.

SEeing I have no other publick Records of the Fathers the Jesuits of *Louvain*, to justify their Propositions concerning the Inspiration of Scripture, than what I have already mentioned, I shall endeavour to supply that defect, by examining the Reasons of the Censure of the two Faculties of Theology of *Louvain* and of *Douay*. I am willing to believe that those Divines had no other design therein, but what was for the Defence of the Truth, or rather their own old Opinions, and that Passion had no part in all that Dispute. As to what concerns the Jesuits, it is probable, that they had not introduced that Opinion into the Colledges of *Flanders*, but in conformity to the Liberty which had been granted to their Professors, not to ingage themselves easily in the maintenance of any Opinions, how old soever, when they did not appear to be warrantable. In a word,

word, the Jesuits make no profession of submitting to the decisions of a Master, as a Rule from which there is no Appeal, *non jurant in verba Magistri*. And seeing there is nothing in that conduct, but what does become wise Men, they are much to be blamed who accuse them for opposing the Opinions that are received and authorised in the most part of the Schools; when those Opinions have no good Foundation: which happened to them in the matter which we now handle.

The Divines of *Louvain* bring for one of the principal motives of their Censure, the conformity that the three Propositions of the Jesuits have to an old Opinion that was condemned in the *Anomeans*, whereof St. *Epiphanius* all through makes mention. But to shew the falshood of this objection, it will be sufficient to bring the Testimony of *Epiphanius*. That Father does say, that the *Anomeans* (a) traduced the Prophets and the Evangelists: that when they were much urged, they avoided the difficulty by answering, that the Apostle spake as a Man. Is there any thing in those three Propositions above mentioned that comes near this? Did the Jesuits of the College of *Louvain* alledge, that there might possibly be something that is false in the Writings of the Apostles, under the pretext that they were Men that spake it? Yet that is the Opinion of the *Anomeans*, who being unable to satisfy the Reasons that were brought against them, out of the Books of the New Testament, said that the Authors of those Books had spoken as Men in those places.

We shall apply the same Answer to another Objection which those Doctors did take from the Preface of St. *Jerom's* Commentaries upon the Epistle of the Apostle *Paul* to *Philemon*. That Father does, in that place, make mention of certain Hereticks who rejected that Epistle, because they alledged that that Holy Apostle was not guided by the Spirit of God in writing it. Those who will not (saith he) receive the Epistle written to *Philemon*, as one of the Epistles of *Paul*, do say, that the Apostle did not speak always, nor all things, by the immediate assistance of *Christ* speaking in him; because human frailty could not suffer one constant tenor of the Holy Ghost. But if it should be granted to those Hereticks, that St. *Paul*, and the rest of the Apostles were not Inspired in all that they writ, it does not therefore follow, that we ought to reject a part of their Writings. It is sufficient, that we own with the Jesuits, that there is nothing but Truth in those very places which were not Inspired, and that the Holy Ghost had committed them to us as such.

Hieron.
proem.
Comm. in
Epist. ad
Philem.

(a) Ελα(ρήμωσι μὴ ἐν πνευματικῇ ὀνόματα καὶ ἀποστόλων ὅταν ἐλεγχόμενοι ἀπὸ πᾶν ἀποστόλου), εὐδὲς ἀποστρέφοντες καὶ ἀποπηδῶντες καὶ λέγοντες, τὸ πῶς ὁ ἀπόστολος ὡς ἀνθρώπος ἔφη. Epiph. Her. 76. n. 6.

Those

Those Sectaries asked the Orthodox, if St. Paul stood in need of *Apud* any Inspiration to say; *When thou dost come, bring my Cloak which I* *Hieron. ibid.* *left at Troas with Carpus, and especially the parchments*; and many *Epist. II. ad Tim. c. 4. v. 13.* other things of that nature. I do declare, that it was in no ways necessary that God should Indite such kind of things to St. Paul, and other Holy Writers. This is the Opinion of the Jesuits of *Lowvain*, which was afterwards confirmed in the same place by *Cornelius à Lapide*, whose words I have already mentioned. But they did not conclude from thence, that we are not obliged to receive the Books of Scripture, in any parts or places thereof, but those only that were Indited by the Holy Ghost. It is sufficient that they were persuaded that the Holy Writers were guided by the Spirit of God in every part of their Writings, so as not to fall into any error.

The Divines of *Lowvain* further objected against the Jesuits, that they had renewed an Opinion, which had been condemned in the Person of *Erasmus*. But it is easie to make it appear, that those Fathers maintained nothing that had affinity to the Proposition which *Erasmus* owned. That Critick was accused for believing that there were * some errors in the Writing of the Apostles; which were * *Τὸ μὴ μοῦνον ἀμαρτία.* to be attributed to a defect of their Memory. We shall find nothing like this in the three Propositions of the Jesuits of *Lowvain*, for although they be very well satisfied, that there was no need of any Inspiration for Writing those things that they knew, they do not upon that account imagin that the Writers were at any time mistaken through a defect of Memory. *Erasmus* also used his utmost endeavour in one of his Apologies, to wipe off that accusation. He does protest, that he only reported that which St. *Jerom* had observed upon the matter, and that there had been nothing said, but what was agreeable to St. *Augustine's* Opinion. Howsoever it is, that Critick does assure us, (b) that he never intended to charge the Apostles with any defect of Memory. I do not inquire if *Erasmus* was wronged in this. It is enough that I have shewn the Proposition, that is supposed to have been condemned on his account, and have wical made it appear, that there is nothing of that nature contained in the three Propositions of the Jesuits that were Censured.

Those very Divines did also by way of Objection, bring the Authority of the Council of Trent, Sess. IV. the words of St. *Peter*, Epist. II. ch. 1. v. 21. and those of St. *Paul*, Epist. II. to *Timothy*, ch. 3. v. 16. But there is nothing in all those places to which the

(b) *Nunc testor me abhorreere ab ullâ oblivione tribuendâ Apostolis.* *Erasm. Apol. adv. Monach. quosd. Hisp.*

Jesuits of *Louvain* do not agree. The strongest Passage is that of the Epistle to *Timothy*, and yet it is the same, upon which *Cornelius à Lapide* made Observations, as I have shewn. As to the Testimony of the ancient Fathers, who said, that the Tongue, and the Hand of the Holy, were the Holy Ghosts Pen, the Jesuits do not deny it. The same *Cornelius à Lapide* has explained it at large, in his Commentary upon the second Epistle of the Apostle *Paul* to *Timothy*, where he makes it appear that it is not contrary to his Opinion about the Inspiration of Scripture. And the truth is, we cannot imagin that the Holy Ghost deprived the Evangelists and the Apostles of the use of their Reason and Memory.

The Reasons of the Doctors of the Faculty of Theology of *Donay* are no more Conclusive than those of the Divines of *Louvain*. They chiefly depend upon some Passages of *St. Augustin*. But since there is nothing that is positive in all those Passages, it will not be worth the while to insist on them. They bring for example, by way of Objection, some places of his Books *Concerning the consent of the Evangelists*. Yet there is no Work, where that Father has more shewn than in that Treatise, that the Sacred Writers made use of their Reason and Memory, when they writ their Gospels. That Work has also given occasion to *Erasmus*, and some other Writers to affirm that the Memory of the Apostles was not always sure, and that they put sometimes one word for another.

It is true, that *St. Augustin* is withal of the Opinion, that that defect in the Apostles was guided by the Holy Ghost. But I think it had been much better not to make them fall into error, than to maintain afterwards with that Father, that they would not so much as amend the faults of that Nature, after they had acknowledged them, upon a Pretext that they were persuaded they had done every thing relating thereunto, by the Spirit of God directing their thoughts. *Erasmus* had also recourse in one of his Apologies to this Answer of *St. Augustin*, seeing he could not deny that he had charged the Evangelists with a defect of Memory, which was the occasion that they put the name of one Prophet for another; he endeavours to get off by answering, That (c) when Memory and Forgetfulness are equally governed by the Holy Ghost, Forgetfulness is then as useful as Memory. *Maldonat*, who attributes this Opinion to *St. Augustin* and *Beda*, had reason to reject it; and indeed it is not to be maintained. Nor can we find any thing in the Propositions of the Jesuits of *Louvain* that has any affinity with it.

(c) *Ubi memoriam & oblivionem gubernat Spiritus Sanctus, ibi tam est utilis obliuio quam memoria.* *Erasm. ibid.*

That which the Divines of *Douay* borrowed of *Gabriel*, for shewing that many Natural Truths were discovered to the Apostles by Inspiration, and that we may very well reconcile Inspiration to the Labour and Meditation of the Sacred Writers, would be agreeable to good Sense, if by that Inspiration we understand a single direction of the Spirit of God, that kept the Apostles from falling into any error. If it be meant on the contrary, that the Holy Spirit did indite the matters of Fact, of which they had been Witnesses, that cannot be maintained, as *Cornelius à Lapide* has observed. Nor is their Opinion established by the example which they bring of Jesus Christ, who could (say they) use such Meditation and Application that is ordinary amongst other Men, if he had Composed any Books; for this proves nothing, because if it be supposed that he had written Books treating of such things as he had seen with his Eyes, we will always maintain, that it was not necessary that he should be the Instrument of the Holy Ghost for Writing things of that nature. This example does moreover appear to be somewhat Metaphysical, and can only be relished by those who are accustomed to the subtilties of the School.

To that which they object, That all the Truths of the Scripture ought to be immediately Inspired; that otherwise, there will be eternal Disputes about what is, and what is not immediately Inspired: I answer, that it is easie to distinguish these two sorts of Inspirations, according to the Principles of the Jesuit *à Lapide*. He does suppose with good Reason, that in Histories of things which were seen and heard, and in the Exhortations that concern Morality, there is no need for any immediate Inspiration, because there is nothing that is Prophetical therein.

But we may (say they) according to this Principle, doubt of all those Writings that are not Prophetical, as the Gospels, for example, if they were immediately Inspired. I affirm, on the contrary that there is no ground for any doubt here. For the same Jesuit has clearly shewn, by the words of *St. John*, and of *St. Luke*, that an immediate Inspiration was not necessary for Writing of Histories. The Evangelists writ that which they had seen, or that which they learned upon certain grounds.

And upon this account, *Maldonat* explaining these words of Jesus Christ, *Matth. xxvi. 28. This is my blood of the New Testament*, and comparing them with these words of *St. Luke, This cup is the New Testament in my blood*; does freely declare that the very words of *St. Luke* Luc. xxi. Jesus Christ, were those that were Recorded by *St. Matthew*, and not those of *St. Luke*. The Reason which that Learned Jesuit brings for this Opinion, is, that *St. Matthew* was present at the Action.

Matthæus qui aderat. Whence he does conclude, that seeing Jesus Christ expressed himself only in one manner, it is (d) better to believe St. *Matthew* who was an Eye Witness, and who was followed by St. *Mark*, than St. *Luke* and St. *Paul*, who were not present at the Action. It is easie to judg, that in that place *Maldonat* had not recourse to Inspiration, since he affirms that St. *Matthew* had barely reported that which he had seen.

Yet for all this, I do not believe, that the Proof which that Jesuit does use against the Protestants, is altogether Conclusive. For it is to be supposed, that the manner wherein the Evangelists express the same thing, does wholly proceed from themselves: It is sufficient that they all agree in the substance of the things, whilst it is not necessary that they should joyn in the Expressions. Every one of them might choose his own Words according to his pleasure. And therefore it cannot be necessarily inferred from *Maldonat's* Reasoning, that Jesus Christ did rather say that which was mentioned by St. *Matthew*, than that which is Recorded by St. *Luke*, and by St. *Paul*.

The Divines of *Douay* do insist yet more vigorously on the third Proposition of the Jesuits of *Louvain*, than upon the two others. This last Proposition does contain (as they think) a manifest error, *manifesti erroris periculum continens*; for it does Authorise such Books for Divine and Canonical, as have been written by Men without any assistance of the Holy Spirit, *humana industria, sine assistentia Spiritus Sancti*. It cannot be denied but that the Jesuits set out this Proposition, which seems to be much like the Opinion of *Grotius* and *Spinosa*: but they add withal, that it is sufficient that the Holy Spirit does assure us, that there is nothing but Truth in those Writings. *Si Spiritus Sanctus postea testetur ibi nihil esse falsum, efficiatur Scriptura.*

We may by the same Reason (say the Doctors of *Douay*) call the Decrees of Popes and Councils Holy Scripture, because we are also assured that there is no falshood in those Decrees. We may also place *Livy*, and *Thucydides* in the number of the Holy Writings, if the Holy Ghost testifie that they contain nothing that is false. But this Consequence does not at all follow from the third Proposition of the Jesuits of *Louvain*. For they Suppose that the Holy Ghost does propose those Books to us as Canonical, to be for a Rule in Religion. The Decrees of Councils, and of Popes, have no such thing in them; if it were so, they would not be any longer considered as

(d) *Credendum igitur est verbis potius Matthæi & Marci, quam Lucæ & Pauli Christum usum fuisse.* Mald. Comm. in Matth. c. xxvi. v. 28.

bare Decrees of the Church, but as works that had been to the same Church, to serve for a Rule as well in Faith as in Manners. The Example of the Histories of *Thucydides* and of *Livy*, which they bring, is nothing to the purpose; for those Authors have not written of things that concern our Salvation.

As to the Maxim of those Divines, *That a thing is not Inspired, because it was afterwards approved, but that, on the contrary it is approved, because it was Inspired*, it does not contradict the Proposition of the Jesuits; who continually suppose, that the Books we chiefly treat of, have the testimony of the Holy Ghost, although they had not been immediatly Inspired; which may suffice to render them approved. The truth is, many Learned Divines believed, that it was not necessary, that God should Inspire *Moses* with a knowledge of every thing that he has written in *Genesis*, concerning the Creation of the World, and the Genealogies of the Ancient Patriarchs. He could be furnished (as they judged) with sufficient light about those things, by what he learned of his Ancestors, who had kept Memoirs of the same. *Doctus & eruditus* (saith the Jesuit *Pererius*) à *Majoribus suis, ad quos ejusmodi rerum doctrina inde ab Adamo usque fidelissimâ posterorum traditione, quasi per manus transmissa, & ad Moysen usque producta fuerat.* Was it necessary, for Example, that *Moses* should be inspired of God, to set down in Writing all the Journeys and different Encampings of the *Israelites* in the Desert, after their coming out of *Egypt*? But I need not stay longer on a thing that has, in my Opinion, been sufficiently cleared. And therefore, I am so far from accusing the Propositions of the Jesuits of *Louvain* as erroneous, that I find nothing to be contained therein, but what is agreeable to Truth and good Sense. The Doctors who opposed them with so great heat, had never exercised their thoughts sufficiently upon Questions of that nature: They followed the old Opinion of their own Schools; and seeing they only consulted their own prejudices, they condemned that with a great deal of precipitation, which they did not altogether understand.

A Learned Doctor of the Faculty of Theology of *Paris*, maintained upon the same subject, a Proposition very opposite to the opinion of the Divines of *Louvain* and *Donay*; which possibly will not appear to be very Orthodox in the judgment of many. His Book was nevertheless many times Printed, with the approbation of several of his Brethren. There was a new Edition thereof Published lately at *Paris*, with the approbation of Mr. *Cocquelin*, a Doctor of that Faculty and Chancellor of the University; who does assure us, that he had read that Work once and again, *legi ac relegi*. Which by anticipation does shew, that I intend to speak of the *Analysis of Faith* of

*Perer.
pref. in
Pentat.*

in 1685.

of Henry Holden, who made it manifest, through the whole Work, that he had meditated much on the Principles of Theology. Take therefore the Opinion of this Learned Person, concerning the Inspiration of the Holy Scripture ; *The special assistance which God afforded to every Author of those Books which the Church has received for the Word of God, does extend it self to those things only that are mere matters of Doctrine, or that have a near and necessary relation thereunto. But in such things as are not the main business of the Author, or have a relation to other things, I reckon that God did assist them in no other manner than he used to assist other Writers, that were Men of great Piety.* I shall content my self to explain the Opinion of this Doctor, without presuming to offer Arguments against it, since I know it is authorised by very sage Masters. Yet I dare not maintain it in its full extent : It would have done well, if he had given us some examples of what he understands by things that are not mere matters of Doctrin, or that have not an entire relation thereunto.

De Dominis, of whom it would seem Holden had his Principles, does much insist on this Subject, which he explains with a great deal of subtilty. He says, that all that is in the Scripture, is not simply and absolutely the Object of our Faith, that is to say, it does not belong to the Articles of our Creed ; because it is only the things that are revealed, that can be the Object of our Faith. But (saith that Author) the things that are contained in Scripture are not all reveal'd : From this Principle, (which he does illustrate by some Examples) he draws this Consequence, that we may in some manner, excuse some very Learned Catholick Divines, who imputed to the Evangelists, a few faults which proceeded from a defect of their memory, as in putting one name for another, in disagreeing amongst themselves about the time, or any other circumstances of the actions which they relate, provided that it falls not upon the substance, and upon the things themselves : (g) Errors of that kind, (he adds) which touch

(c) *Auxilium speciale divinitus præstitum auctori cujuscunque scripti quod pro verbo Dei recipit Ecclesia, ad ea solummodo se porrigit quæ vel sint purè doctrinalia, vel proximum aliquem aut necessarium habeant ad doctrinalia respectum. In iis vero quæ non sunt de instituto scriptoris, vel ad alia referuntur, eo tantum subsidio Deum illi adfuisse judicamus, quod piissimis cæteris auctoribus commune sit.* Henr. Hold. div. fid. Annal. lib. 1. c. 5.

(f) *Non omnia quæ in Scripturis continentur esse simpliciter & absolute objectum nostræ fidei, seu spectare ad articulos fidei : sola enim revelata sunt objectum fidei, ac non omnia quæ Scriptura habet, docet aut narrat, sunt revelata.* De Dom. lib. 7. c. 1.

(g) *Tales enim lapsus extra substantiam facti nihil fidei obstant, aut obesse possunt, neque sunt circa aliquid fidei divinæ credendum, sed circa id quod solam humanam sensatam secum fert notitiam. Humanam porro notitiam subesse posse lapsui non videtur absurdum, etiam in sacris Spiritus Sancti scriptoribus, quoties lapsus humanæ notitiæ in facti substantiam & adjunctam revelationem non redundat.* Ibid. not

not the substance of the things, cannot in the least, be any prejudice to our belief, seeing they do not relate to that which we are obliged to believe of Divine Faith, but only to that which is known by the senses; which may be deceived, even in the Sacred Writers, when the substance does not come under debate.

Yet although *de Dominis* does explain this opinion at good length, he declares, that he dares not prosecute the same to the full. He avows, that there are many places in the Bible, in which it seems that the Writers are mistaken; that the solutions that are given for removing difficulties of that nature, are very much constrained, with which pious Souls ought nevertheless to be content, although they do not satisfy those who severely examine every thing. (b) He does choose rather to take the part of those who are far from rigour, than charge the Holy Writers with the least fault, even in the things of small importance. But after all, he does not disapprove the Opinion of the Catholick Doctors, who alledged mistakes of that kind, which are not prejudicial to our Faith: There is nothing that does more diminish the Authority of the Holy Scripture, even in things Essential and Revealed, than constrained Answers, that provoke laughter in those, who are not of the same belief with us: By this we perceive, that the Archbishop of *Spalatro* was in a strait, whose part he was to take, about a Question of this delicacy.

As for Doctor *Holden*, of all he says upon that Subject, this is most full of good sense, (i) That we ought not to approve or condemn, upon the bare words of Scripture, all that belongs solely to Philosophy. For as he observes in the same place, though there is nothing false in Scripture; the expressions therein are frequently accommodated to the Opinions commonly received amongst the People, and they are not always very exact; which is agreeable to St. *John Chrysostome's* Opinion, who observed (k) that St *Paul* does often speak according to the Sentiments of the Populace, that he may accommodate himself to his Auditors.

(h) Ego sanè quod in me est rigorem depono, & malo cum difficultate piam amplecti interpretationem, quam lapsam etiam istum levem & circa solas circumstantias admittam. Ibid.

(i) Veritates Philosophicæ nec probandæ nec improbandæ sunt ex puris nudisque Sacrae Scripturae verbis & sententiis. Quamvis enim nullam complectatur Scriptura falsitatem, attamen ipsius loquendi modus ut plurimum vulgaris est, atque ad communem hominum captum, potius quam ad loquelæ proprietatem & sermonis rigorem adaptatus. Hold. ibid.

(k) Τα πολλά ἃ καὶ ὁ κοινὸς ἀνίσταται ἢ ἀκούων ὁ Παῦλος φησὶν, καὶ ἐπαναχρῶ φιλοσοφίᾳ. Chryl. Hom. 9. in Epist. ad Philipp. c. 2.

CHAP. XXV.

Spinosa's Objections against the Inspiration of the Books of the New Testament are Examined.

Although *Spinosa* had very little or no knowledge of the Books of the New Testament, yet he would by all means, insert in his Treatise Entitled *Theologico-politicus*, a whole Chapter against the Inspiration of those Books; where he only gives a greater light to that which *Grotius* had formerly written upon this matter, in many places of his Works. His great Principle is, (a) that the Apostles did not write as Prophets, but as single Doctors; and that therefore it was not necessary that they should be Inspired. But this distinction betwixt Prophets and Doctors, does not at all destroy that Inspiration, which is attributed to the Apostles; which does only consist in a bare direction of the Spirit of God, as has been shewn before.

God (say they) did not command them to write, as he commanded the Prophets to publish their Prophecies: We have also observed from the beginning of this Work, that, when the Ancient Ecclesiastical Writers speak of the Gospels, they declare, that they were composed only occasionally, and at the request of the first Believers. It does not indeed so evidently appear to us, that the Evangelists and Apostles had an express Commandment of God, or even of Jesus Christ, to publish Books for the Instruction of the first Christians, as it does appear, that the Prophets did speak to the People of *Israel*, by Gods Order. But we see, that Jesus Christ commanded his Disciples to go and Preach the Gospel, to all Nations of the Earth: But their Histories, which we call Gospels, are nothing else but Collections of their Sermons, which were animated by the Spirit of God, whom their Master had promised to them.

The Prophets (*Spinosa* continues,) do not only observe in their Prophecies, but also in their Letters, that it was God who spake by their Mouth; which he proves by the Letter that the Prophet *Elias* writ to King *Joatham*, and is mentioned 2 *Chron.* Ch. 21. v. 12. Which

(a) *Apostoli non tanquam Prophetæ, sed tanquam Doctores scripserunt, & viam ad docendum elegerunt quam faciliorem judicaverunt fore discipulis quos tum docere volebant.* Spin. Tract. Theol. polit. cap. 12.

begins with these words, *Thus saith the Lord*, (b) we read no such thing, (saith he) in the Letters of the Apostles. St. Paul on the contrary, speaks as from himself, in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 7. v. 40.

If the Style of the Apostles be not altogether the same as that of the Prophets; it cannot from thence be concluded, that the former were not guided by the Spirit of God, in all the actions of their Ministry. It was in no wise necessary, that they should repeat in every discourse, that it was the Lord who spake. It was sufficient, for them to declare in general, that Jesus Christ had sent them to Preach the Truths of the Gospel, and that he, who had given them that Mission in his Father's Name, had told them expressly, *It is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Heavenly Father who speaks in you.*

It is true, that St. Paul does speak as from himself, in the first Epistle to the *Corinth.* Chap. 7. where he makes use of this Expression; *I give my judgment*, *καὶ τὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω*. But he adds withal, that he thinks he has the Spirit of God: *δοκῶ δὲ καὶ ἔχειν πνεῦμα Θεοῦ*. The ground of Spinoza's error was, that a Man could not use his Reason, and be also guided by the Spirit of God, at the same time; as if by becoming God's Interpreter, he must cease to be a Man, and be only a Passive Instrument, if I may use the Term: To proceed, it is not true, that the Apostles never observed at the beginning of their Letters, that it was God who spake by their Mouth. For they begin their Letter, which they write to their Brethren of *Antioch*, by these words, *It seem'd good to the Holy Ghost and to us*; to let them *Acts xv.* know, that what they laid upon them came from God, whose Interpreters they only were.

The other expressions of St. Paul, which Spinoza, in the same place, makes use of to shew, that that Apostle writ to gratifie his own inclination, without being encouraged thereunto by the Spirit of God; may be easily explained by the Principle which we have established. That Man does always suppose, that Inspiration does wholly deprive one of the use of his Reason; which is most false: (c) The Apostles, (saith he) are every where upon Reasoning, so that they are more like Disputants than Prophets. But besides, that he has formed to himself a false Idea, of the Inspiration of the Prophets, 'tis sufficient if we object against him, the example formerly given, where the Apostles, after they had deliberated and reasoned

(b) In Epistolis Apostolorum nihil simile legimus, sed contra in I. ad Cor. 7. 40. Paulus secundum suam sententiam loquitur. Spin. *ibid.* cap. 11.

(c) Apostoli ubique ratiocinantur: ita ut non prophetare, sed disputare videantur. Spin. *ibid.*

in an Assembly; did nevertheless use this expression, *it seem'd to the Holy Ghost and to us*: Which does evidently shew, that the Spirit of God, who had guided them in that Assembly, did not deprive them of the use of their Reason: There is in effect, a Subordination betwixt them two; the one does not destroy the other.

Spinoza's Prophets are Enthusiasts, who are more like Men push'd on by a Spirit of Fury, than by a Spirit of Prophecy. He does alledge (d) that the quality of a Prophet does not admit of the use of his Reason; because he, who confirms his Doctrines by Reasons, does submit to the judgment of others. But if one will carefully read the Books of *Moses*, whom he reckons amongst the Prophets, he will own, that that Law-giver does Reason sometimes: There is indeed a submission to the judgment of others, where there is nothing but Reasonings. But this cannot be said, when such Reasonings are guided by the Spirit of God: And this was the Case of *Moses* and the other Prophets. *Spinoza* himself gives an Example here; For there is none, but thinks these Words of *Moses*, Deut. Chap. 31. v. 27. *While I am yet alive with you this day, ye have been rebellious against the Lord; and how much more after my Death*, to be very formal Reasoning. And indeed, the Prophets who directed their discourse to Men who made use of their Reason, did not in the least destroy their Spirit of Prophecy, when they proposed the Will of God to those Men, by way of Reasoning.

But *Spinoza* (who reasons in all this Discourse upon a false Idea which he had of Prophecy,) does alledge, (e) that that expression of *Moses*, was a Moral kind of speaking, which he used as an Orator, to foretel, and represent to the life (so far as he could imagin) the future Rebellion of the *Israelites*. But what does it signifie, that *Moses* did express himself an Orator, or in any other manner, does that prove, that he did not truly Reason in that, and several other places, where he explains himself as other Men? It was not necessary that God should indite all his Reasonings and all his Exhortations. It is enough that he guided him by his Spirit, and that he prevented his falling into error. This being supposed, we will freely agree with *Spinoza*, that *Moses* said many things, that were not revealed to him; and this we have proved elsewhere.

He is also obliged (f) to declare, that the Prophets could Reason

(d) *Prophetie auctoritas ratiocinari non patitur. Quisquis enim vult sua dogmata ratione confirmare, eo ipso ea arbitrari uniuscujusque judicio submittit. Spin. ibid.*

(e) *Verba illa Moysi moralis locutio tantum sunt, quàm rhetoricè & prout futuram populi defectionem vividius imaginari potuerat, prædicat. Spin. ibid.*

(f) *Nolo tamen absolute negare Prophetas ex revelatione argumentari potuisse. Ib. by*

by Revelation ; and consequently Prophecy and Revelation are not incompatible. The Apostles then, could by way of reasoning, propose to the People the truths they delivered, and be at the same time, Inspired with the Spirit of God. *Spinoza* does nevertheless add, that the more that the Prophets do reason in form, the Knowledge that they had of things revealed, did come so much the more near to natural Knowledge ; and that that which does characterize the supernatural Knowledge of the Prophets, is, when they pronounce Sentences and Degrees without any Reasoning. For this reason it is, (saith he) *Moses*, who was the greatest of the Prophets, made no Argument in form ; that on the contrary, *St. Paul* does reason every where, and draws consequences from the Principles which he does establish, as appears in his Epistle to the *Romans*. Upon this account, he believed, that the Epistles of the Apostle were not written by supernatural Revelation.

That Man does always confound Prophecy with Enthusiasm. *Moses*, who was a Law-giver, pronounced Sentences and Judgments by warrant from God ; which did not hinder him from Reasoning in some places : If he did not so, as frequently as *St. Paul*, the occasion was, he writ Histories, which require no reasoning ; whereas *St. Paul* does write as a Doctor who instructs the People, and draws consequences from Principles which he had laid down. From thence it cannot be concluded, that he followed nothing but his Reason, because that very Reason of his might have been supernaturally enlightened, and guided by the Spirit of God. And therefore, all that *Spinoza* does object for shewing, that the most part of that Apostle's Discourse, does only consist in Advertisements and Moral Exhortations, does not destroy the Inspiration of the Apostles, in the manner as we have formerly supposed it with the Jesuits of *Louvain* : For we made it plain, that it was not necessary, for that purpose, that God should indite to *St. Paul* and the other Apostles, all their Discourses of Morality. It was permitted them to make use of their natural Lights, and to use all the means with which their Reason could furnish them, for persuading the People.

After the same manner, all *Spinoza's* objections may be answered ; seeing he does continually reason upon a false Idea, which he has formed, of the Inspiration of the Pen-Men of the New Testament : We may also give our assent to a great part of what he says in his Objections, without giving advantage, for drawing any Conclusions against that Inspiration, according to the true Explication thereof. Seeing I insisted long enough upon this Subject, in my two Answers *To the Opinions of some Divines of Holland*, it is needless for me to repeat here, what I have said in those two Books. The truth is, those

Divines, by opposing the Inspiration of the Holy Scripture, have only given a more advantageous light to *Spinoza's* reasons, who squared this matter, to the false prejudices with which he was prepossessed. If he had read the Works of some Catholick Doctors who have treated judiciously of this Subject, he would soon have acknowledged, to what little purpose the most part of his Objections serve, because they stumble upon those things in which we do agree with him. And therefore, we ought to be very cautious, in refuting his Opinion, that we do not contest with him in vain, about the things that are true, and from which he does nevertheless draw consequences, that are directly false or too wide; otherwise, we shall rather strengthen, than destroy his errors.

CHAP. XXVI.

Of the Stile of the Evangelists and the Apostles. The Opinion of Modern Writers, and of the Ancient Doctors of the Church upon this matter; with many Critical Reflections.

*Henr.
Steph.
Nov. Test.
in 12. c.
dit. ann.
1576.*

IN this last Age, there have been Works composed, that treat of the Stile of the Evangelists and the Apostles. *Henry Stephen* has handled this matter in the Preface to his Greek New Testament. He had also promised to publish a Treatise on purpose upon this Subject, to demonstrate, that those Sacred Writers are much more Polite than some Authors have believed. He likewise gives some examples thereof, in his Preface, by way of anticipation. He does sometimes admire them, for the elegancy of their Stile, and does wish, that they were not treated as rude and barbarous Persons, in respect of their manner of Writing, as they have been by some. He does particularly undertake the defence of *St. Paul*, whom he believed to have been very conversant with the *Greek* Authors, and amongst the rest, with the Poets, whom he did imitate (as he believes) for his Expression, in sundry places. (a) Whence he does

(a) *Hæc cum ita sint, & cum a'undè pateat Paulum Apostolum Græcos scriptores evoluisse, qui credibile sit illum Græcæ lingue non satis peritum fuisse?* *Henr. Steph. ibid.*

conclude, that to affirm that that Holy Apostle was not Master enough of the *Greek Language*, is a supposition that is altogether incredible.

We have moreover a Dissertation published by *Phocæn*, which is Entituled, * *Of the purity of the Greek Language of the New Testament* * *Diavri- be de lin- gue Græ- ce Novi Testamen- ti*. (saith *Phocæn*) *verè Græcum nec alienum planè d ei purita- Stilo Græce profano esse asserimus*. He does refute all those *He- te. braisms*, which as some alledge, are contained in the Writings of the Apostles: and to make it the more evidently appear, that they object those *Hebraisms* in vain, he does justify those Expressions on which they are charged, by the like Expressions of Profane Authors.

There are on the contrary some Learned Criticks, who, very far from allowing the Apostles a Pure and Elegant Stile, have not scrupled to make them pass for Barbarous Writers, whose Books are stuffed with *Hebraisms*. *Castalio*, who understood *Hebrew* and *Greek* sufficiently, to be judge of this Question, says, in speaking of the Apostles, (b) that being born *Hebrews*, they did *Hebraize* when they writ in *Greek*, whilst the Holy Ghost had no part in that, because the Spirit of God *does not love Hebraisms any more than Græcisms*. He only Indited the thing to them, (saith that Author,) and not the Words, leaving them at liberty to express themselves after their own fashion. Which is agreeable enough to the Opinion of the Jesuits of *Lowvain*.

Castalio does further shew, why the Apostles did no more improve themselves in the *Greek*, so as to speak it well, seeing that Language is Copious in Words, full of Sense, and easie to be understood, whereas the *Hebrew* Phrases render their Discourses intricate and obscure. He says, (c) that they were accustomed to the reading of the Sacred Writings, and that since they did not sufficiently understand the *Greek Language*, (as it is easie to prove by their Works) those expressions that were proper to their Mother Tongue did first present themselves to them on all occasions. Which

(b) *Erant Apostoli natu. Hebræj, & peregrinà, hoc est Græcà linguà scribentes hebraizabant, non qui juberet Spiritus; neque enim pluris facit Spiritus hebraismos quam græcismos: res enim dicitur Spiritus, verba quidem & linguam scribendi liberam permittit.* Sebast. Castal. de cens. Translat. Bibl.

(c) *Cur igitur hebraizarunt? Primum quia erant Sacris Literis assueti; deinde quia cum essent Græcæ lingue non usque adeo periti, ut quod eorum scripta ostendunt, facile in patriam consuetudinem desisterent.* Castal. ibid.

he confirms by the example of the *French* and the *Dutch*, who cannot write in Latin, without intermingling something of their own Language therewith. *Dum Latine scribunt, Gallizant & Germanizant.* This latter Opinion, which has been followed by very able Criticks, is more agreeable, than the former, to the Opinion of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers. I think we ought to acquiesce in the Judgment of the *Greek* Fathers, who are faithful Witnesses of the *Greek* Stile of the Evangelists and the Apostles.

Origen was the only Man of all the *Greek* Fathers, who applied himself most to the Study of the Scripture, in a manner that was most exact and Critical. And therefore his Judgment upon the Question, ought of all others to have the most weight with us. When that Learned Person Disputes against the Enemies of our Religion, who despised the Prophets and the Apostles, because of their Stile, and because the same things (say they) were much better expressed in the Writings of the Ancient Philosophers. He makes answer to them, that we ought not upon that account to despise the Books of the *Jews* and the Christians, because it has been always agreed, that the *Jews* had written before the *Greeks*. As to the Stile, he does own that the *Greeks* have the advantage; but he does withal alledge that it cannot be inferred from thence, that their Works are better than those of the *Jews* and of the Christians. He does likewise observe, that the Books of the Old Testament are not destitute of their ornament in the *Hebrew* Language. Which he does affirm of the Writings of the Apostles, because, the truth is, they had no Politeness in their Expressions, having applied themselves more to the Eloquence of Things, than of Words.

(d) The Prophets of the *Jews* (saith *Origen*,) and the Disciples of Jesus renounced all Ornaments of Discourse, and every thing which the Scripture does call human Wisdom; and according to the Flesh. If any *Greek* (that Learned Father continues) should have a design to teach a Doctrine, that were profitable to the *Egyptians* and the *Syrians*, he would rather choose to learn the Barbarous Languages of those Nations, than to be useless by speaking *Greek* to them. (e) The thing is the same (according to him) in the Providence of God, who did not only consider those amongst the *Greeks*

(d) Οἱ ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ πεποιθότες καὶ οἱ τῷ Ἰησοῦ μαθηταὶ οἱ μακρὰν χρόνον εἰπόντες τῇ ποιίᾳ αὐτοῦ λέγειν σοφίαν, καὶ τῇ, ὡς ἀνύμωσιν ἢ γρηῃ, σοφία ἀνθρώπων καὶ σοφία καὶ σώτης. Orig. adv. Cell. lib. 7.

(e) Οὕτως ἡ προνομία τοῦ Θεοῦ φάνηκε, ὅτι καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, συγκατέβη τῇ ἰστορίᾳ τοῦ πληθους καὶ ἀπρωμύθων, ἵνα τοῖς συνέδοσις χρησαμένη λέξει περιελαβόντων ἐπὶ ἀπρώμωσι τὸ καὶ ἰδιωτῶν πλῆθος. Orig. ibid.

who

who were Men of Learning, but rather the ignorant Community. And therefore it was suitable to the exigency at that time, that they should accommodate themselves to the Stile of the meaner sort, that they might gain them, in speaking their Language.

Upon this Principle we ought to form an Idea of the Apostolical and Evangelical Stile, and not upon the prejudices of some Protestants, who believe that they stand for the Authority of the Scripture, by allowing nothing that is very mean to have proceeded out of the Mouth of the Apostles. But St. Paul himself declared to the *Corinthians*, who despised him, because of his Language; that he came not to Preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ with excellency of Speech, or of Wisdom. For Christ (saith that Apostle) sent me to Preach the Gospel, not with wisdom of Words. St. John Chrysostom has observed, upon this Passage of St. Paul, that if the Apostles in their Sermons, did not use the Stile of the wise Men of the Earth, (f) that ought not to be attributed to the weakness of the Gift of Tongues which they had received, seeing they took that course, that they might not obstruct the Preaching of the Gospel. If it be so, (that Father adds) why was *Apollo*, who was an Eloquent Man, sent to the *Corinthians*? To which he answers, that he was not chosen because of his Eloquence, but because he was mighty in the Scriptures, and vigorously refuted the *Jews*: δυνατός ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς καὶ ἐλεγχε τοὺς Ἰουδαίους.

St. Chrysostom does very much insist upon this, to shew that the Apostles were rude in their Expressions, and unskilful in the Greek Tongue. (g) When the *Greeks* shall accuse (saith he) the Disciples of Jesus Christ, for not using a Discourse more polished than what the commonalty did pretend to, and for being altogether unlearned, we ought to grant all this, and to enforce the like charge, more than they. He also reproves those of his time, who alledged that St. Paul was a Learned and an Eloquent Man. He makes mention of a Dispute which was held about it in his time, betwixt a *Greek* and a *Christian*. He thought it was a ridiculous thing in the Christian to maintain that St. Paul understood the Greek Language perfectly. All (h) that Dispute went upon a comparison of St. Paul with *Plato*. The *Græcian* endeavoured to demonstrate that St. Paul was an illiterate Man.

(f) Οὐκ ἀδυνατεῖ τὸ χαλεπότητος· ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ βλαβῇ τὸ κήρυγμα. Chrysost. Hom. 3. in Epist. 1. ad Cor. cap. 1.

(g) Ὅταν ἐν Ἑλλήνισι καταρροήσῃσι καὶ μαθηταῖς ὡς ἰδιωταῖς, πλείον ἡμεῖς ἐκείνων καταρροῦμεν αὐτοῖς. Chrysost. ibid.

(h) Περὶ Παύλου καὶ Πλάτωνος ζητήσαντες ὄντες, ὁ μὲν Ἕλληνας ἐπηρεάζτο δοκεῖν ὅτι ὁ Παῦλος καὶ ἀμαθὴς καὶ ἰδιώτης· ὁ δὲ Χριστιανὸς ὡς ἀρεταίας ἐκπαιδευτὸς καταπαύει τὸν Πλάτωνα λογιώτερος καὶ ὁ Παῦλος. Chrysost. ibid.

The Christian, on the contrary, was so silly as to undertake to prove, that St. *Paul* was more Learned and Eloquent than *Plato*. But as that Holy Bishop observes, the *Græcian* on that occasion, said what the Christian ought to have said: the Christian on the contrary, made use of such words as would have better become the *Græcian*.

It is no new thing to find Christians defend the purity of the Stile of the Apostles. If *Henry Stephen*, *Phocben*, and some others had lived in St. *Chrysostom*'s time, he would have found also in them the like Conduct, which he would not have failed to brand with the title of ridiculous. He would have said to them, as to those who lived in his days, (*i*) that the same thing therefore may not befall you, and that the *Greeks* may not deride us in Dispute, let us accuse the Apostles of being illiterate persons; for such an accusation is their praise. And the truth is, the Power of the Gospel did not consist in the Knowledge and Eloquence of the Apostles, but in the Efficacy of the Word of God. The *Mahometans* admire the greatness and majesty of the Stile of their Alcoran. The Christians on the contrary, who acknowledge the most part of the Writings of the New Testament to be but simple and mean as to the Stile, are nevertheless persuaded of the truth of their Religion, which was Preached by Men, (*k*) who were obscure and illiterate. (*l*) This is no matter of defamation (St. *Chrysostom* does add) when we speak of such Disciples of Jesus Christ. It is rather matter of their praise, who being such persons made themselves renowned through the whole World.

And therefore *Origen* made no scruple to give some examples of the simple and mean Stile of the Apostles, and also to observe their Solecisms; which some Fathers have done after him. He says that (*m*) the Apostles who were persuaded of their mean capacity, as to human literature, to which they had never applied themselves, did freely declare the simplicity of their Stile, and that they were very little acquainted with the Rules of Discourse, although they were very skilful in the matters of Religion. The same Father does observe in many places of his Works, that St. *Paul*'s diction is full of

(*i*) Ἰν' ἐν αὐτῶν πείρῳ, μὴ καταλαμῶσα, ἔπο δὴ μετ' αὐτοῖς ὅτι Ἕλληνας ἐπιστάν ἡμῖν πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἀγῶν ὡς, κατηγεγῶμεν ἀποστόλων ὡς ἀμαθῶν· ἢ γὰρ κατηγορία αὐτῶν, ἐγκώμιον. Chryl. *ibid*.

(*k*) Ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀγεσμίμαται καὶ πίνητες καὶ εὐτελεῖς καὶ ἀσύνητοι καὶ ἀφανεῖς. Chryl. *ibid*.

(*l*) Οὐκ ἔστι βλασφημία τῶν ἀποστόλων ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ δόξα, τὸ πὺν πιστεῖν τῶν οἰκουμένης πᾶσι λαμπερότερος φανέσθαι. Chryl. *ibid*.

(*m*) Οὐκ ἀσυναίσθητοι οἱ ἀπόστολοι τυγχάνοντες τῶν ἐν οἷς περιστάσεων, καὶ θεὸς αὐτῶν ἐν ἡρώλῳ, φασὶν ἰδιῶται τῶν λόγων, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ γραφῇ. Orig. *Pauc* c. 4.

Hyperbates,

Hyperbates, nay even of Barbarisms, which made him obscure. St. *Irenæus* (n) who also acknowledged those Hyperbates in that Apostles Stile, did attribute the same to the readiness of his Discourse, and to the vigor of that Spirit which was in him. I should never have done, if I should particularly relate all the Testimonies of the *Greek* Writers concerning the simple and low Stile of the Evangelists and the Apostles. They have not so much as excepted St. *Luke*, though it is generally believed that he had a more exact knowledg of the *Greek* Language, than the rest of the Writers of the New Testament.

The *Greek* Scholiasts who have written on *St. John*, observe, after *St. Chrysostom*, in the Prefaces which they prefix to that Evangelist, that *St. John* was (*o*) of a pitiful Village called *Bethsaida* in *Galilee*, the Son of a poor Fisher, who was altogether ignorant of that which the Men of the World call good Literature, himself a rude and plain Fisherman, who could neither speak nor write. The Cardinal *Toletus*, who writ a judicious Commentary upon *St. John's* Gospel, speaks no otherwise of that Evangelist's *Stile*, in a Summary prefixed to his Commentary. There he affirms that *St. John* (*p*) does speak worse *Greek* than the other Evangelists, that he is stuffed with *Hebraisms*; and that to understand him, it is necessary to know the *Hebrew* as well as the *Greek*. He desires us to (*q*) observe well the Causal Particles, the Illatives, the Conjunctives, and others of that Nature, which have a great force in all his Discourse, because the Sense does sometimes wholly depend on those Particles.

Enjedime, a subtil Unitary, did also enlarge his Observations on the Stile of that Evangelist, which he looked upon as very obscure, and very hard to be understood, (r) *If we* (saith he) *ought to call that*

(n) Quoniam autem hyperbatis frequenter utitur Apostolus propter velocitatem sermonum suorum, & propter impetum qui in ipso est spiritus ex multis quidem aliis est invenire. Iren. adv. Hæc. lib. 3. c. 7.

(ο) Οὐ πὺς ὁ ἀναγγελιστὴς πατρίδος ἐμῆς, ὡς ἦτορ καί ποτε ἐν ταῖς ἀπὸ Βηθσαιᾶς τῆς Γαλιλαίας, πρὸς τὴν ἀλυσίαν καὶ πύλιντον πατρίδας διὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἑαυτῶν μαρτυρῶν ἔτος ὁ ἀλυσίος καὶ ἰδιωτὴς ἰδιωτεσθῆναι τὴν ὁρμήν· ὁ ἡρώδης μὴ εἰδὼς, &c. Schol. Gr. in IV. Evang. ex cod. MS Bibl. Colb.

(p) Minus quam ceteri Evangelistæ Græcè locutus est. Hebraicis phrasibus abundat. Unde fit ut Hebraici sermonis peritia, non minus quam Græci, ad sensum sententiarum assequendum sit necessaria. Franc. Tol. argum. Comm. in Joann.

(q) *Attendendum est maximam vim in particulis casualibus, illativis, consinuativis, ceterisque ejusmodi esse positam, ut interdum una particula integrum sententia sensum contineat & ostendat.* Tol. ibid.

(r) Si obscuritas concisa, abrupta, minimè sibi coherens, & ex allegoriis constans oratio sublimitas dicenda est, fateor Joannem esse sublimem. Nam vix ullam Christi concionem ab eo relaxam invenias, quæ tota non sit allegorica & intellectu difficillima. Georg. Enjed. proœm. in Joann.

greatness of *Stile* which is an *obscure Discourse*, abridged and interrupted, without any connection, and which is full of *Allegories*, I avow, that in that *Sense*, *St. John's Stile* is sublime: for he makes no *Harangue* concerning *Jesus Christ* which is not *Allegorical*, and very difficult to be understood. He does strongly insist (*s*) on the obscurity of the beginning of that Gospel, where (as he thinks) we can find nothing but figurative words, and uncouth forms of Speech. There is not a Word or Diction therein (as that *Unitary* does add) but what may be Expounded, several, different, nay even opposite ways. This being so, I admire the headstrong prejudice of the Protestants and *Unitaries*, who dare oppose the common Belief of all the Churches of the World, having no other Foundation but that of Records, which they acknowledge to be so obscure and difficult to be understood. It is true that the Protestants do not altogether agree about the obscurity of Scripture; especially in the most important places; but the *Unitaries* in this matter, shew more Candor, not denying a thing which is obvious. They only desire that the number of the Fundamental Points of our Faith be limited.

It is not sufficient to study the *Greek Language* in Profane Authors; seeing the Writers of the New Testament have a particular *Stile* that is abstruse, and requires an extraordinary Application. *Hentenius* has very partly observed in his Preface which he prefixed to his Version of the Commentaries of *Euthymius* upon the Gospels. (1) That the Apostles and the Evangelists being born *Hebrews*, did follow, in their Writings, the Genius of the *Hebrew Language*, which frequently puts one time for another, and has many other things peculiar to it. He adds, it is not only *St. Matthew*, who does imitate this *Stile* of the *Hebrew*; but the other Evangelists do it also. That one may be acquainted with this *Stile*, it is fit to read the *Greek Version* of the Septuagint, which the Apostles have imitated. It is further necessary to study particularly the *Stile* of every Book of the

(1) Principium Evangelii Joannis est obscurissimum, quod figuratæ voces, inusitatæ loquendi formulæ, præcipuè autem diversitas & opinionum in verbis Joannis explicandis varietas & contrarietas ostendit. Nulla enim fere vocula est, certè nulla clausula, quæ multiplices & inter se diffidentes interpretationes non habeat. Enjed. ibid.

(2) Animadvertendum est Evangelistas & Apostolos cum genere Hebræi essent hac in re, sicut & in aliis multis, Hebraicum secutos idioma, quo illi frequentissimè præsentis quod proprium non habent, aut pro futuro efferunt præteritum. Utque in universum dicam, tempus unum pro alio Hebræi sæpenumero collocant. Quod etiam Evangelistæ non raro fecerunt, nec solus *Matthew*, qui patriâ scripsit linguâ, hoc est Hebræâ, sed & cæteri qui Græcè scripserunt, &c. Joann. Hent. præf. Verl. Comm. Euthym. in Evang.

New Testament. For although they are written in a certain Language, which I elsewhere called the Language of the Synagogue, every Writer has something peculiar to himself.

Of all the Holy Writers, St. Paul is most hard to be understood; who sometimes comes to a full stop before he has done: which has given occasion to so great a number of Hyperbates, or Transpositions in his Epistles. Gagnejus, who writ very judicious Notes upon those Epistles, calls the Reading, or Stile of St. Paul, *Lectionem turbulentam & salebrosam*, i.e. an obscure and rugged Stile. (u) He is persuaded of their obscurity, because of their abstruse Stile wherein they were written, which he thinks almost impossible to be explained, without the same Spirit that St. Paul had. He does withal admire the impudence of the Protestants, who having quite another sort of Spirit than what the Apostle had, do insolently boast, that they understand them, without any other assistance, than that of their own Spirit: I should have some cause to glory, (saith that Divine) if I could give some light to St. Paul's obscure Stile, which (as many think) that Apostle did expressly affect. *Non parum gloriabor, si quid lucis Pauli tenebris adjecisse inveniatur, ut multi putant, de industria affectatus.* But that Apostle, in that, did the rather follow his Spirit, which represented to him many things at once. And therefore, sometimes he only begins a Discourse, and leaves it incomplete, nay he raises some objections to which he makes no answer.

I know that St. Augustin in his Books concerning the Christian Religion, composed a Chapter expressly to shew that there was true Eloquence in the Holy Scripture, especially in St. Paul's Writings, where he finds perfection of Wisdom, accompanied with the greatness of Eloquence. But seeing that Father did not understand the Greek Language, we ought in this case to prefer the Opinion of the Greek Fathers to his. He seems nevertheless, in that place, to speak only of a kind of Eloquence, that he calls Wisdom, and which he makes to consist rather in Things, than in Expressions. If St. Paul was Eloquent, because of some Figures which St. Augustin observed in his Stile, there is almost no Author but may pass for Eloquent upon that score. There is indeed a force in that Apostle's

Aug. l. 4.
de Doct.
Christ.
c. 7.

(u) Salebrosas illas Pauli Epistolas plerumque lectitanti mihi tam longis hyperbaris biulcas, tot anapodotis inabsolutas, tantâ sensuum profunditate inaccessas & invias visum est non hic divinatoris Apollinis Pythone, sed divino Pauli spiritu opus esse. Unde non possum illorum non admirari impudentiam, qui cum non Pauli, id est pacis ac quietis, sed schismatum ac dissensionis spiritum habeant, confestim nullo interprete absque sanctorum & doctorum hominum Commentariis que cavillari solent, in nos se Pauli mentem tenere impudenter arrogant. Gagn. Epist. dedic. Schol. in Epist. Pauli.

discourse: There are very high thoughts, and a perfect knowledge of Religion: But all this is not called Eloquence, according to the common notion which we have of the Word. He himself declares, writing to the *Corinthians*, who charged him with rudeness of Speech, that his discourse was mean, and that he had not the art of speaking, or did not use *enticing words of Man's wisdom*.

St. *Jerome* does plainly assure us, (x) that that acknowledgment of St. *Paul* did not so much proceed from the deep humility that was in him, as from the Truth which he owned, because his Tongue could not well express his profound and hidden thoughts. That Apostle, (saith he) being an *Hebrew*, and having studied under *Gamaliel*, a Doctor of the Law, is put hard to it, when he would express what is upon his Spirit, although he had from his Infancy, Learned the *Greek Language* at *Tarsus* in *Cilicia*. He does alledge after *Origen*, that St. *Paul* (y) used many forms of Speech, which were peculiar to those of *Cilicia*, where he was bred, and likewise he gives some examples thereof, which I do not here examin. He adds, that that is no surprising thing, seeing *Virgil*, who was a perfect Master of the Latin Tongue, has nevertheless made use of some expressions that were peculiar to those of his Country.

That Father, as to what he further alledges with so great freedom of St. *Paul's* Style, has given us nothing but what he had read in the Ancient Ecclesiastical Authors, and what St. *John Chrysostom*, who lived at the same time, has shewn at large in his Eloquent Homilies, which he Preached to the People. Yet St. *Augustine* was of a belief, contrary to the Opinion of St. *Chrysostom*, and the most Learned of the Ancient time (z) that he ought to make an Apology for St. *Paul*, by answering a sort of Men of his time, who despised that Apostle, because he made no shew of Eloquence in his discourse.

But *Origen*, who was not ashamed to produce St. *Paul's* Solecismes,

(x) Illud quod crebro diximus, etsi imperitus sermone, non tamen scientiâ, nequaquam Paulum de humilitate, sed de conscientie veritate dixisse etiam nunc approbamus. Profundus enim & reconditos sensus lingua non explicat; & cum ipse sentiat quid loquatur, in alienas aures puro non potest transferre sermone, quem cum in vernaculâ linguâ habeat disertissimum, quippe Hebræus ex Hebræis eruditus ad pedes Gamalielis viri in lege doctissimi scriptum interpretari cupiens involvitur. Hier. Epist. ad Alg. qu. 10.

(y) Multa sunt verba quibus juxta morem urbium & provinciarum sue familiaribus Apostolus utitur -- Nec hoc miremur in Apostolo, si utatur ejus lingue consuetudine in qua natus est & nutritus; cum Virgilius alter Homerus apud nos patriæ sue sequens consuetudinem sceleratum frigus appellet. Hieron. ibid.

(z) Malè doctis hominibus respondendum fuit, qui nostros auctores contemnendos putant, non quia non habent, sed quia non ostendant quam nimis isti diligunt eloquentiam. Aug. de Doct. Christ. lib. 4. c. 7.

did judiciously observe (a) that that Apostle, who was appointed by God to be the Minister of the New Testament, had in his Preaching, and not in Mens Wisdom, shewn the virtue and efficacy of the Gospel, that the Conversion of Nations might not be attributed to that Worldly Wisdom. And therefore St. Paul and the other Apostles have no need of Apologies, which might afford him a Sanctuary, against those reproaches which may be cast on them, about the manner of their Writing, seeing God was pleased, not to make use of Orators for the Preaching of the Gospel, but simple Fishermen who had no Learning.

Further, it does not yet follow, but that it is demonstrable, that the most part of the words that St. Paul, and the other Writers of the New Testament have used, are good *Greek*; only the Symetry of their Phrases, and their modes of Speech are not always accommodated to the *Greek*, which is not extraordinary. For every Nation has a peculiar manner of expressing their own thoughts; and though they deliver them in terms that are purely *Greek* or *Latin*, we soon perceive, that the Order is not altogether *Greek* or *Latin*. We need only for Example, look on the *Greek* Version of the Psalms, and upon the Ancient *Latin* Translation, which was done out of the *Greek*; we see there something that is singular, and not agreeable either to the *Greek* or the *Latin* Genius; when it is even supposed, that the words are pure *Greek* and *Latin*. And for this reason, those amongst the *Greek* Fathers, who had a perfect knowledge of the *Greek* Language, were sometimes at a loss, as to their comprehending the *Greek* of the Septuagint.

We may further observe, that if the Ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, had known the *Hebrew* as well as the *Greek*; they would not have found the Style of the Sacred Writings so barbarous as some of them believed. I am astonished, that St. Jerome who understood both Languages, did not take this way to explain what seem'd to be most strange in their Style, rather than accuse them of Solecisms and Barbarisms. I believe, that in those places, he followed the Opinion of Origen, whom he frequently transcribes. Indeed, he does sometimes admire the greatness of St. Paul's thoughts: He acknowledged, that that Holy Apostle had applyed himself to the study of Profane Authors, whom he sometimes quotes. But after all, he is of the mind, that we ought not to look for Eloquent Discourses in the Writings of the Apostles, because Jesus Christ did not intend to

(a) Ἰσχυροτέρως (Παῦλος) ἀπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου τῆς χάριτος διὰ τῆς χάριτος ἀποδείξει πρὸς τὸν διδάσκοντα, ἵνα ἡ ἡμετέρα συγγραμμάτων μὴ ᾖ ἐν σφίσι ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐν διδασκάλῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Orig. Philoc. cap. 4.

have his Church composed of Orators and Philosophers, but of Men who were the Dregs of the People. *Ecclesia Christi non de Academia & Lyceo, sed de vili plebe congregata est.*

CHAP. XXVII.

Of the Language of the Hellenists or Grecians; if that which bears that name, be in effect, a Language: The Reasons of Salmasius against that Language, do rather establish than destroy it. The Greek of the New Testament may be called the Greek of the Synagogue, the Jews Hellenists read in their Synagogues the Hebrew Text of the Bible, as well as the Jews.

* Εγγιω
 2. ΕΛΛΗ-
 νισται.

There are some Passages in the *Acts* of the Apostles, from which there are Proofs commonly drawn, that the *Jews*, when Christianity began, were divided into two Parties. The one were * purely called *Hebrews*, and the other *Hellenists* or *Grecians*. Those who remained in the Territory of *Babylon*, after they were first dispersed, retained the name of *Hebrews*; because they spake the very Language, which was used beyond the River *Euphrates*, and which, for that reason ought to be called *Hebrew*, although it was *Chaldee*. And the *Jews* who dwelt in *Palestine*, after their return from the *Babylonish* Captivity, were also purely called *Hebrews*; because they brought from *Babylon* the *Chaldaick* Language, which they called *Hebrew*. These *Hebrews*, in their Synagogues, read the *Hebrew* Text of the Law and the Prophets, to which they joyned Glosses that were written in the *Chaldee*, which was their Vulgar Tongue.

They called those *Grecians*, who were *Jews* of *Alexandria*, and many other places where they spake the *Greek* Language. These read in their Assemblies, the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint, which they joyned to the *Hebrew* Text, to be used as an Interpretation. They were called *Hellenists* or *Greeks*, because they spake *Greek*, and read no other Books, in their ordinary custom, than what were written in *Greek*: Yet they always maintained a particular respect for the Original *Hebrew* of the Bible. And therefore in their Synagogues, they continued to read it in *Hebrew*, no less than the other *Jews*; which

which is still practised by the *Jews* at this day, in all places where they are, through the whole World. The *Jews*, for Example, of the *Spanish* Nation and Rite, the *Dutch Jews*, who live in *Holland* and the Neighbouring Provinces; and in a word, all the *Jews* of what Nation soever, read in their Synagogues, the Holy Scripture in the Original Language: They are called *Spanish* and *Dutch*, because of their Vulgar Tongue.

There were at that time also, *Jews* who spake *Greek*, whom they likewise called *Greeks* or *Hellenists*, and the Language in which the most part of their Books were written, has been called in this Age, the *Hellenistick* Language. This Language is *Greek* in respect of the words, but the order of the Phrase is *Hebrew* or *Chaldee*; as we still see at this day, that the *Spanish Jews* have composed the Translations of the Bible in a kind of *Spanish* Language, which is hard to be understood by any one who does not understand the *Hebrew*: It is the same thing in their other Versions of the Bible, in whatsoever Language they are written. They do not only continually mix therewith, some *Hebrew* or half *Hebrew* words; but their manner of expression, in all the Vulgar Languages, has also a great affinity with the *Hebrew*. The Ancient *Greek* Version of the Septuagint was written in this sort of *Greek*, as well as the Books of the New Testament, and they called this Language *Hellenistick*, because it was in use among the *Jews* who spake the *Greek* Language, and who are called *Hellenists* or *Greeks* in the *Acts* of the Apostles.

Vossius, who frequently frames Maxims, which he does not confirm by any solid Proofs, does alledge, that those were called *Hellenists*, who favoured the *Greeks*; and that the Word *Ἑλληνιστῶν* does signifie that, in the same manner as *Ῥωμαίων* & *Περσίων* do signifie to favour the *Romans* and the *Persians*. And thus that incomparable Person does often judge of things merely by Grammatical Notions, without being in any measure concerned, whether those notions do, or do not agree to the things, to which he applies them. But if we should confine our selves only to the Grammatical sense of the Word *Ἑλληνιστῶν*, it is certain, that it does signifie, as well in Profane as Ecclesiastical Authors, to speak *Greek*; and likewise, to speak that Language in its purity. He thinks that those among the *Jews*, were called *Hebrews*; who, by reason of the great zeal they had for their Law, were unwilling to submit to the *Greeks* and the *Romans*, and would by no means allow that their Nation should pay tribute to Strangers: The rest on the contrary, were called *Hellenists* who paid tribute with good will.

But all this is a mere imagination, that has not the least shadow of Reason, and which signifies nothing; as to that Passage of the

Acts

Acts of the Apostles, Chap. 6. where there is mention made of the *Hebrews* and *Hellenists*, or *Greeks*. *St. Chrysostom*, *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, and many other Fathers, did not by those *Grecians* understand any other *Jews*, but those who had the *Greek* for their *Vulgar Language*; whereas the rest spake the *Chaldee* or *Babylonish Tongue*. *St. Luke* (saith *Oecumenius* speaking of the former) (a) calls them *Greeks* or *Hellenists*, not upon the account of their Religion, but because they spake the *Greek Language*: Although they were *Jews* as well as others, they are not commonly called *Hebrews*, because they spake not the *Hebrew*, or rather the *Chaldee Language*. That *Hebrew Language* had continued among the *Jews* of *Palestine* since their return from *Babylon*, and they look'd upon themselves to be more considerable than the rest of the *Jews*, who were dispersed through the several Provinces of the *Roman Empire* where they spake *Greek*.

The most able Critics of our Age, have owned the *Hellenistick Language*, to which they have had frequent recourse for explaining many Passages of the New Testament. Yet *Salmasius*, and after him *Crojus*, have used their utmost endeavour to cry down this new Language, which (as they imagin) was unknown to all the Ancients, and which is, as they alledge, chymical, seeing it cannot be reduced to any of the Ancient *Greek Dialects*.

The former has expressly written two Books upon this Subject, one whereof is entitled, *De Hellenistica Commentarius*, and another, *Fusus Linguae Hellenisticae*. He does really, in these two Works, shew himself to be a Man of great Learning: But he is so far from destroying that Language, as he pretends, that he does confirm it in several places.

The Patrons of the *Hellenistick Language* never believed, that there was a *Greek Dialect* of that name; and so, all *Salmasius's* long Discourse upon the several *Greek Dialects*, is nothing to the purpose. Further, seeing we intend not to dispute with him on words, it shall be granted, that the word *Hellenist* does signify *Greek*; and that those who speak not that Language properly, ought rather to be called *Non-Hellenists* than *Hellenists*. The truth is, in the Prohibition that *Julian* laid on the Christians, not to apply themselves to the Study of the *Greek Language*, he uses this word *ἑλληνίζειν*; as it does signify to speak pure *Greek*. And therefore *St. Gregory of Nazianzen* calls him in derision, *φιλέλληνα καὶ φιλόλογον*, a lover of the *Greek Language*; and he tells him, (b) he who made this Law, has forbidden us to

(a) Ἑλληνιστὰς ὃ ἐστὶν ὁ ἑλληνιστὴν, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἑλληνιστὴν φησὶ γράμματα καλεῖ. *Oecum.* in c. 6. *Act. Apolt.*

(b) Ὁ νόμος οὐκ ἐπιτάττει ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑλληνίζειν μὴ ἐκφέρειν τὸ ἑλληνισθῆναι ἐκ ἑαυτοῦ. *Greg. Naz. Orat. 1. adv. Jul.*

speak in the Attick Dialect, but he has not restrained us from speaking the Truth.

In this sense, there are no true *Hellenists*, but those who have a perfect Knowledge of the *Greek* Language: which does differ from the *Hellenistick* Language, and this I would rather call the *Greek* of the Synagogue, because it owes its Original to the Synagogues of the *Jews*. But those who first call'd this Language the *Hellenistick*, did it only in conformity to that place of the *Acts*, where the *Jews* are called *Hellenists*, and not according to the ordinary notion of the word *Hellenist*. *Salmasius* does grant, that there are many *Hebraisms* in the Version of the Septuagint, and in the Writings of the Apostles. He only denies, that we ought, upon that account, to call that the *Hellenistick* Language, in which those Books were written: Otherwise, (saith he) we ought to give the same name to the Ancient Latin Version of the Bible, because there is also a great many *Hebraisms* in that Version: But it was necessary that it should have been written in *Greek*, before it could be called an *Hellenistick* Version. We do not call the Language of the Septuagint, and of the New Testament *Hellenistick*, merely because it contains many *Hebraisms*, but because it is *Greek* mixed with *Hebraisms*.

There may be any name chosen and applied in this case, provided that there be an agreement in the thing it self: It is vain to dispute on words, when the matter is past dispute. Now *Salmasius* does, in his two Books, suppose certain Principles which manifestly establish the Language which some Criticks, in this last Age, have called the *Hellenistick*. He assures us, for example, that the Seventy Interpreters, who understood the *Greek* very well, (c) could have made a Version, of better *Greek*, and free from all the *Hebraisms* and *Barbarisms* with which it abounds. He is of the Opinion that these *Hebraisms*, were occasioned by the too great care they took to render the *Hebrew* words literally, and to express the force they have in the Original. According to this supposition, the *Greek* of the Septuagint is not pure, but *Greek* mixed with *Hebraisms*; and they have likewise given new significations to *Greek* words, the better to express the sense of the Original. This is that which is called the *Hellenistick* Language: Thus you see, how *Salmasius* is become a great *Hellenist*, whilst he never dream'd any such thing.

(c) *Nisi verbum verbo in pluribus reddere curassent, longè, ut ita dicam, Græciorum & omnibus Hebraismis eorundemque barbarismis repurgatam potuissent edere translationem. Hebraismi non aliunde exorti sunt, quàm ex vertendi modo qui se verbis alligat, qui sensa non exprimere contentus, etiam vim ipsam vocularum representare satagit.* Salm. Epist. dedic. Comm. de Hellenist.

(d) When they inserted (saith he, speaking of the Septuagint,) the *Hebrew* modes of Speech, they did not draw them from the copiousness of the *Greek* Language, but from the *Hebrew* Text, to which they adhered very closely: *Salmasius* does use his utmost endeavour, to confirm by those words, the *Greek* Language of the Synagogue, otherwise called the *Hellenistick* Language. 'Tis no great matter how it is called, provided the thing be plain. He declares, that he always allow'd, that the words of that Version are *Greek*, but that the Phrase is *Hebrew*; *De re semper inter omnes constitit verba esse Græca, Phrasim Hebraicam*: If it be so, why did he write two pretty large Books, in which he disputes on nothing else but the name that is to be given to that Language? The only thing that he is careful for, is to shew, that there never was a Dialect amongst the *Greeks*, that was called the *Hellenistick*. *De re totâ* (saith he) *disputatur, & quaritur, an omnino fuerit, hoc est, an Hellenistica aliqua dialectus fuerit*: We freely grant, that there never was any Dialect of this name, amongst the *Greeks*. And therefore, I have elsewhere called this Language of the *Jews* *Hellenists*, a *Greek* of the Synagogue: And in the same manner, we may at this day distinguish the pure *Spanish* amongst the *Jews*, from the *Spanish* of the Synagogue, into which they have translated the Bible of that Language. They have also framed on the same Model, an *Arabick* of the Synagogue, a *Persian* Language of the Synagogue, in which they have written their Translations of the Bible, and their Prayer-Books. If we have not this Idea, in reading the *Greek* of the Septuagint and the New Testament; we cannot have an exact knowledge of the Style of those Books, which are not written in a Language that is purely *Greek*, as *Salmasius* himself does suppose, with those whom he calls *Hellenisticaries*.

Seeing it is so, I do not see to what purpose the most part of that Critick's Questions do serve, which he has proposed in his Commentary concerning the *Hellenistick* Language. To what end, for example, does he so exactly inquire, (e) if the Language which the Seventy Interpreters use in their Version, does constitute a particular Dialect, and if they reckoned amongst those Dialects, that which

(d) *Cùm Hebraicos loquendi modos inseruere, non ex Græcâ copiam quâ abundabant eos hausserunt, sed ex textu Hebraico, cui nimis se in vertendo adstringebant, sumpserunt. Salm. ibid.*

(e) *An dialectus peculiaris constituenda sit ea eloquutio quâ Septuaginta Interpretes in Bibliis transferendis usi sunt. An plures quàm quinque dialectos Græci noverint, & an Hellenistica inter eas dialectos meminerint. An Hellenistica nomen conveniat ei phrasique verbis Græcis Hebræos concipit intellectus. Salm. init. Comm. de Hellen.*

was called *Hellenistick*? If the appellation of the *Hellenistick* Language does agree to that sort of Phrase, whereof the words are *Greek* and the conceptions *Hebrew*; it was an easie matter for him to compile large Treatises, by that Method, because he does seldom or never treat of the matter in Question: After he had enumerated all the Dialects of the *Greeks*, he concludes, (f) that it is more clear than the day; that that *Greek* Language that belonged to no Nation, and that had no mark, to characterise or distinguish it from other Dialects, is not a true Dialect.

But that was not the thing he was to prove, because we are of the same Opinion with him, that that which some able Criticks have called the *Hellenistick* Language is none of the *Greek* Dialects. They only think, that that Language is not pure *Greek*, by reason of the *Hebraisms* with which it abounds. The *Hellenistick* Language, according to those Criticks is a Language that contains *Greek* words and *Hebrew* Phrases: *Lingua Hellenistica est quæ verbis Græcis utitur, phrasibus Hebraicis.* All the Question then is to know, if the Version of the Septuagint, and the Books of the Old Testament be written in this manner: Since he himself does grant this, it may be concluded from hence, that those Writers have no particular and proper Language. It is not to be look'd for in any Dialect of the *Greeks*, nor in any Nation in particular, but in the Synagogues of the *Jews-Greeks* or *Hellenists*. As, if at this day, I would know, what is the Language of the Bibles Printed in *Spanish* at *Ferrara*, and at *Constantinople*; I would not look for a particular Nation that speaks that Language, but would consult the usage of their Synagogues. The Apostles who frequented the Synagogues of the *Jews-Hellenists*, and who read with them, the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint, borrowed the expressions thereof; besides, being *Jews* by Birth, and the *Chaldee* being their Mother Tongue, it was very hard for them not to mix some *Hebraisms* and *Chaldaisms* with the *Greek* in which they writ.

Crojus, who is of the same Opinion with *Salmasius* upon this Subject, did likewise establish the *Hellenistick* Language in the same manner as *Salmasius* had done, though he had at the same time, an intention to destroy it. That Author, after he had recounted many things, which were no way for the purpose he designed them, does conclude against *Heinsius*, a Hero of the *Hellenificary* Party,

(f) *Ex his quæ proposuimus sole manifestius liquet, ejusmodi eloquutionem Græcam, quæ nec ullius certæ gentis unquam propria fuit, nec certas habuit notas verbis inherentes quibus discernetur ab aliis dialectis, non posse videri dialectum, nec teneri definitione dialecti.* Salm. Comm. de Hellen. p. 84.

that the Evangelists and the Apostles are not *Hellenists* ἡellenιστῶν, because they did not speak good *Greek*, but did *Hebraize* or *Chaldaize*, ἡεβραΐζον, χαλδαΐζον, their Phrases being *Hebrew*, *Chaldee* and *Syriack*. Whereby he does establish that *Hellenistick* Language, whereof the words are *Greek*, and the Phrases *Hebrew*. He asks *Heinsius*, how he can reconcile these two things, viz. (g) That *St. Paul* and the other Writers of the New Testament are *Hellenists*, and at the same time do *Hebraize*: 'Tis easie to reconcile the Two. For *Heinsius* and the rest of the *Hellenisticaries*, do not take (as it has been already observed) the word ἡellenιστῶν To be an *Hellenist*, in the sense that the *Greeks* ordinarily used it in; they do not think, that it does in that place, signifie to speak pure *Greek*, but that which has been mentioned before. And therefore *Crojus* does, no less than *Salmasius*, dispute about words: For the avoiding of which inconveniency, we shall call that Language the *Greek* of the Synagogue.

But whence was it (it may be said) that those *Jews-Hellenists*, whose Vulgar Language was the *Greek*, spake that *Greek* of the Synagogue, that is to say, a *Greek* mixed with *Hebraisms* and *Chaldaisms*; seeing the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee* was not then in use amongst them? *Philon* for Example, who was one of those *Jews* that were called *Hellenists*, spake *Greek* very well. He does not in the least make any thing appear in his Works, that comes near the *Greek* of the Synagogue.

To this it may be answered, that the *Greek Hellenists* did continually read the *Hebrew* Bible in their Synagogues, as well as the other *Jews*, who called themselves purely *Hebrews*: Although those *Hellenists* writ some particular Works in pure *Greek*, which had nothing of the *Greek* of the Synagogue, it was not the same thing as their *Greek* Versions of the Bible, and some other of their Books. Seeing in these Works, they confined themselves to the *Hebrew* Text, they expressed the form of the *Hebrew* Phrase. This may be justified by the *Arabick*, *Persian*, *Spanish*, and the Vulgar *Greek* Versions of the Bible, which were made by the *Jews*. There are pure *Hebraisms* owned to be in all these, although the Authors thereof were *Jews*, who spake those Languages: Which could proceed from nothing else but their scrupulous adhering in their Translations, to the Words of the Original *Hebrew*.

It is true, that the most part of those who defend the *Hellenistick* Language, believe, that the *Jews-Hellenists* did read no other Bible

(g) Si Apostolus ejusque collega ἡellenιστῶν, ut in omnibus fere observationibus contendit Heinsius, quomodo profiteri potest eos ἡεβραΐζον. Joann. Croj. Sacr. Obs. in N. T. c. 34.

in their Synagogues, but the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint; but they are mistaken in that. Even *Salmasius*, who declared himself very much against the *Hellenisticaries*, does assure us, that the *Jews* in whatsoever place they were, did continually read the *Hebrew* Text of the Bible in their Synagogues. They who pretend to prove the contrary, by the 146 Constitution of *Justinian*, did not narrowly enough observe the words of that Constitution, which shews it quite otherwise: Yet *Lewis Cappel* and several other Learned Criticks (b) depend on that Emperor's Novel to demonstrate, that the *Greek Hellenists*, in their Liturgy or Office, did use the *Greek* Language, till the beginning of the Seventh Age, and that they had read no other Scripture, in their Synagogues until that time, but the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint. *Grotius* was also of this Opinion in his Note on the sixth Chapter of the *Acts* of the Apostles, where there is mention made of the *Hellenists*. (i) Those *Jews* (saith he) were Religious *Jews*, and having lived at *Alexandria* and the neighbouring places, had retained the custom of reading the Scripture in *Greek*, which custom continued till *Justinian's* time, as appears by the 146 Novel.

But the words of that Novel, which 'tis fit to set down in this place, do expressly make the contrary manifest. The *Jews*, in *Justinian's* time, were divided into two Parties: The one was for reading only the pure *Hebrew* Text in their Synagogues; the other, besides that Text, read the Ancient *Greek* Version of the Septuagint, instead of an Interpretation, because they understood not the *Hebrew* Language. The Emperor *Justinian* does declare, (k) that having understood their discord, he thought it expedient to apply a remedy thereunto by a Judgment: The account of their dispute is conceived in these terms. (l) Some amongst them, who only retained the *Hebrew* Text of the Bible, were for reading it alone, at

(h) *Quin & inter Hellenistas ad septimi usque seculi initium liturgia Judaeorum Græcâ linguâ peragebatur, non Hebraicâ. Singulis enim Sabbatis lectio ex Mose & Prophetis in Synagogis ex Græcâ & Septuaginta Versione fiebat: quod liquet ex novella Justiniani constitutione 146. Lud. Capp. qu. de loc. parall. Vet. & Nov. Test.*

(i) Ἑλληστίων. *Judaorum Religione, sed qui cum Alexandria & vicinis in locis vixissent antea, morem inde retinuerant sacra scripta legendi Græcè, Ἑλληστί- qui mox mansit ad Justiniani tempora, ut cognoscimus ex Novella 146. Grot. Annot. in c. 6. Act. Apolt.*

(k) Ἀμφισβητούντες ἀλλήλους καὶ δόντες αὐτοῖς ἐκ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀπειρίας αὐτοῖς καταλυτικὴν ταραχὴν. Novel. 146. tit. de ebr.

(l) Οἱ μὲν μόνον Ἑβραῖαι τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν εὐνοῦν, καὶ αὐτῇ κατὰ τὴν ἑβραϊκὴν βίβλον ἀναγινώσκοντες βέλονται. Ibid.

the

the publick Service in the Synagogues. (m) Others, on the contrary, alledged that besides the Original *Hebrew*, the *Greek* Interpretation ought to have been used. We ought chiefly to take notice of these last Words, which give us to understand, that the matter in agitation was not simply to have the Bible in *Greek* in the Synagogues of the *Jews* *Hellenists*, as is commonly believed, but to joyn the Reading of the *Greek* Version to the Reading of the *Hebrew* Text.

This will yet more clearly appear by the very words of *Justinian's* Decree, (n) who pronounced Sentence in favour of those, who, besides the Original *Hebrew*, read in their Assemblies a Version in *Greek*, or in another Vulgar Language, according to the places of their abode. (o) He Ordained therefore, that it should be permitted to the *Jews*, who had a mind to it, to read the Holy Writings in *Greek*, in those places where the People understood the *Greek*, and in every other Language, for example, in *Latin*, according to the Language of the Country where they dwelt.

Cappel did not understand the Sense of this Ordinance of *Justinian*, when he endeavoured to prove that the *Jewish* Doctors did at that time forbid, under the pain of an Anathema, the publick reading of any other Scripture but the Original *Hebrew* in their Synagogues. Whence he concludes, that the Custom which is at this day amongst the *Jews*, of not having their Liturgy in the Vulgar Tongue, but in *Hebrew*, was not introduced amongst them, but since the publication of the *Talmud*. If he had diligently read *Justinian's* Constitution, he would have been satisfied, that they read in those days the Law and the Prophets in *Hebrew*, in all the Synagogues of the World. But they added afterwards to the *Hebrew*, a Version or Paraphrase in the Vulgar Language of every Country. They of *Jerusalem*, for example, and all *Palestine*, who called themselves purely *Hebrews*, joyned an Interpretation in *Chaldee* to the reading of the Original. There is also a probability, that the Custom the *Jews* have still at this day, of reading privately every *Saturday*, a *Parasce*, or Section of the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, did proceed from that ancient usage of the Synagogues who joyned the reading of the Paraphrase to the *Hebrew* Text.

(m) Οἱ ὃ καὶ τῷ Ἑλληνίδι σεσγλαμῶσιν ἀξίως. Ibid.

(n) Καθὼς κεῖναι μὲν εἶ ποὺ καὶ τῷ Ἑλληνίδι φωνῶν σεσε τῷ τῷ ἱερῷ βιβλίῳ ἀνάγνωσιν παρελαμῶσιν ἐξέλογτας, καὶ φωνῶν πῶσιν ἀπλῶς καὶ ὁ τοῦτος ὀπιηδωστίαν καὶ μᾶλλον γινώσκον τοῖς ἀκούσιν εἶ ποῖ. Ibid.

(o) Θεοπύλου πόντω ἀδείαν εἶ τοῖς βασιλεύουσιν Ἑβραίοις καὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς τὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐν Ἑβραίοις ἐλας τὸν εἰς διὰ τῷ Ἑλληνίδι φωνῶν τὰς ἱερὰς βίβλους ἀναγινώσκον πῶς συνίσσιν, ἢ καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ τυχόν, τῷ Ἰταλῶν ταύτης φωνῶν, ἢ καὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ ἀπλῶς πῶς τοῖς συμπατριωτικῶν τῷ γλώσσῃ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ ἀναγινώσκον. Ibid.

The *Jewish* Doctors did not therefore, prohibit at that time, the reading of the *Greek* Version, and other Translations of Scripture, as if they had read those Versions only in their Synagogues; but they decreed that there should be no Version added to the reading of the Original Text, which had been practised till that time. They had used an Interpreter till that time, who rendered the words of the *Hebrew* Text in the Language of the People. Which appears by the *Talmud*, and all other Books which Treat of the *Jewish* Laws and Customs. That ancient usage has altogether ceased amongst them. They have indeed Translations of the Bible in their Vulgar Tongues, but they read these only privately. This they also observe as to their Service Books, which they read in *Hebrew* in all their Synagogues, although they have Translations of them in several Languages.

CHAP. XXVIII.

A more particular Discussion of the Reasons alledged by Salmasius, against the Language that is called Hellenistick. Several difficulties also relating to this matter are cleared.

THIS should be the place to observe particularly the principal *Hebraisms*, which are scattered through the whole New Testament: but besides that my only design is to explain the Style of those Books in general, they may be found Collected in the Sacred Philology of *John Vorstius*, who has enlarged sufficiently on this Subject. The answer of *Thomas Gatakerus* to the Dissertation of *Phocben*, (*vid. if* he be the *English Whittaker* — if this Authors Name was *Thomas*) may likewise be consulted in this matter. I shall speak of these two Books, and some other the like, in the third Part of this Critical History. I shall only confine my self here to *Salmasius* his Reasons, by which he pretends to shew, that all that is said of the *Hellenistick* Language is without a Foundation.

This Learned Critick does absolutely deny that the Seventy Interpreters were *Hellenists*, because this Name can only be attributed to the *Jews*, who were dispersed into several Countries, out of the Land of *Judab*. But it is Universally agreed upon, that the Seventy belonged to *Jerusalem*, and that consequently they were purely *Hebrews*.

*Salm. in
Epist.
dedic.
Comm. de
Hellen.*

brews. In *Jerusalem* they did read the Bible in *Hebrew*, and not in *Greek*. If they joyned to it any *Gloss*, it was written in the Language of the *Jews* of that Place, that is to say in the *Chaldee*. The same thing (saith *Salmasius*) may be alledged as to the Apostles, who for the most part were *Jews* Originally, and who lived in *Judab*, even after the death of *Jesus Christ*. How then is it possible that they could be *Greeks* or *Hellenists*? There was only *St. Paul* amongst them, who (being of *Tarsus* in *Cilicia*, where they spake the *Greek* Language) could assume the quality of a *Jew-Hellenist*. But having been bred at *Jerusalem*, where he Studied under the Renowned Rabbins *Gamaliel*, he denominates himself a mere *Hebrew*, *Hebraeus ex Hebraeis*. Indeed, since he was of the *Pharisees*, he cannot be reckoned in the number of the *Jews-Hellenists*, who did read the Bible in *Greek* in their Synagogues.

It is easie to solve all these difficulties with the least trouble imaginable. It may be observed, that although the Appellation of *Jews-Hellenists*, was given to those who were scattered out of *Judaea*, into those several Countries where they spake the *Greek* Language, this does not hinder, but that there may be found true *Hellenists* even in the Land of *Judab*: for every *Jew* who writ in that *Greek*, which we have formerly called the *Greek* of the Synagogue, may be called a *Hellenist*, by reason of the Language he used in writing his Works. Upon this ground, when it shall be supposed, that the Authors of the ancient *Greek* Version, which is ascribed to the Seventy Interpreters, were of *Jerusalem*, they are truly *Hellenists*, because they Composed their Version in a *Greek*, that is full of *Hebraisms* and of *Chaldaisms*. The Apostles who were of *Galilee*, and consequently natural born *Jews*, are also in this Sense *Jews-Hellenists*, if they be considered as the Authors of such Books as they writ in the *Greek* of the Synagogue. *St. Paul* was indeed born a *Hellenist*, having learned the *Greek* Language from his Infancy: but being afterwards Educated in the Schools at *Jerusalem*, he became a pure *Hebrew*, as to what concerned the Rites and Usages of those of his Nation. Yet he ought to be reckoned among the *Hellenists*, if we consider his Works, which are written in a *Greek* Stile full of *Hebraisms*, in which, by common suffrage, the *Hellenistic* Language does consist.

Salmasius does object against this, that the modes of Speech in a Language do change according to the Times, whilst the name of the Language does not change. If so, it cannot be said, that an *Hebrew* or *Syriack* Phrase, which is delivered in pure *Greek* terms, can constitute a particular Language or Dialect of a Nation. It does only give a new Character of the Language. The Stile of the

Poets,

Poets, for example, is very remote from the ordinary *Greek*. Yet none ever affirmed that that was a particular Language. So it cannot be said that the *Hellenistick* Language, does make a particular Dialect common to a whole Nation, as if it were a Language spoken by the Community. They were content to confine it to their Synagogues, and the Works of those who writ in the Language of the Synagogue. Let it be only called, if one please, a new Character in the *Greek* Language. But this is nothing to the Question, seeing we Dispute not of the Word, but of the Thing. *Salmasius* does grant, that the *Greek* Version of the Septuagint, and of the Books of the New Testament are written in *Greek*, full of *Hebraisms*: we require no more for the Confirmation of the *Hellenistick* Language.

It is possible that the *Hellenisticaries* abuse the Word Language. But it is sufficient that they do explain what they understand by this Word, and that they own, that they did not intend thereby the General Language of a Nation. For it is certain, that the *Jews*, *Greeks*, or *Hellenists*, did every one speak the *Greek* Language of the places where they were. *St. Paul*, for example, spake the *Greek* which was in his time used at *Tarsus*. *Philon* spake the *Greek* of those of *Alexandria*: and seeing he had Studied that Language with great Application, he writ in a Stile that was exceedingly polished. Nevertheless all the *Jews*, who were *Greeks* or *Hellenists*, did not write in the Language which is here called the *Hellenistick*, because it was Consecrated chiefly to the use of the Synagogues, and was framed according to the Language of the Holy Writings. The *Jews* who were purely *Hebrews*, and who writ in *Greek*, were more *Hellenisticaries*, than the *Jews-Hellenists* themselves, because their Stile did more abound with *Hebraisms*, and *Chaldaisms*, than that of the *Hellenists*, who had the *Greek* for their Vulgar Language.

And though we should suppose with *Salmasius*, that the most part of the Disciples of Jesus Christ, being *Galileans*, and of the Dregs of the People, spake no other Language but the *Syriack*, it could not from thence be proved, that the Books of the Old Testament that are in *Greek*, are not written in the *Hellenistick* Language. All that can be proved from that supposition is, that the Apostles did then compose their Works in their Mother Tongue, which was the *Syriack*, and that they were afterwards Translated into *Greek* by Interpreters, who accompanied them in their Travels, and who understood the *Greek* Language. This is truly the Opinion of that Critick, who believed that the most part of the Apostles were but very slow in learning the *Greek*, at that time when they were com-
O mandated

manded to Preach the Gospel to the *Gentiles*. (a) It is likewise probable, (saith he) that several of them Preached the Gospel to the *Greeks* and *Romans*, by Interpreters, there being only those of them who were *Greeks* by Birth, (for example, St. Paul,) who Preached in *Greek*.

But that supposition is so far from destroying the *Hellenistick* Language of the Books of the New Testament, that it does establish it the more. For *Salmasius* assures us in the same place, that the *Greek* Books that were Translated out of the *Hebrew* and the *Syriack*, do more abound with *Hebraisms* and *Chaldaisms*, than those which had been written in *Greek* before that time. And therefore he alledges, that there are much fewer *Hebraisms* in St. Luke, and in St. Paul, who understood the *Greek* Language, than in St. Matthew, who had been Translated out of the *Hebrew* or *Chaldee*. (b) He confirms his Observation by the Authority of St. *Jerom*, who acknowledged, (as he thinks) this difference of Stile, betwixt the Books that were written in *Greek*, and those which were Translated into that Language. All that can be concluded from his Supposition is, that the Books which were written by the Disciples of Jesus Christ, who were *Galileans*, were not composed by *Jews-Hellenists*, but by mere *Hebrews*, in the Language of their Country, which was the *Chaldaick* Language.

He cannot conclude from thence, that the *Greek* of the Books which we have at this day, is not a *Greek* of the Synagogues. On the contrary, the Distinction that he makes betwixt the Works, which were then written in *Greek*, and those which were Translated out of the *Hebrew* and the *Chaldee*, does manifestly suppose it. Nevertheless we ought not to oppose, in this matter, all the Ancients, who believed that of the four Evangelists, St. Matthew did only write his Gospel in *Hebrew*. As for the *Hebraisms*, which he thinks abound more in the Books that were Translated out of *Hebrew* into *Greek*, than in others, *Vorsinus* is not altogether of the same mind. For he believes that there are more *Hebraisms* in St. Luke's Gospel, than in the other Gospels. He likewise adds, (c) that he could

(a) Sed & plures ex iis verisimile est per interpretem Græcis & Romanis Evangelium adnuntiasse, exceptis si qui Græcè noverant, utpote inter Græcos nati, quod de Paulo certum est. Salm. de Hellen. p. 254.

(b) Hanc differentiam stili in Græcè translatis, & merè Græcis, notavit aliquot locis Hieronymus. Salm. ibid. p. 258.

(c) Ego cœnenderim S. Lucam plus Hebraismorum usurpasse, quàm ullum ceterorum Novi Testamenti Scriptorum, & in uno capite primo Evangelii Luca vel quinquaginta: in uno verò ejusdem capitis versiculo, vel quatuor, aut plures Hebraismos demonstrare possim. Joann. Vorst. Philolog. Sac. part. 2. Epist. dedic.

easily shew fifty *Hebraisms* in the first Chapter of that Evangelist, and four and more, even in one Verse : indeed it may very well be that St. *Luke* may make use of more pure *Greek* Terms, than the other Evangelists do, and yet for all this, have a Phrase that is altogether *Hebrew* or *Syriack*.

Salmasius does further assure us, against the Opinion of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, (d) that amongst all the Apostles, it was only St. *Paul* who understood the *Greek*. Which he proves by their citing the Old Testament according to the *Hebrew* Text, and not according to the *Greek* of the Septuagint. But we have already shewn the contrary : and although St. *Jerom* is sometimes of that Opinion, he frequently takes the opposite side upon very good Reasons. The Reason, (*Salmasius* adds) why the Passages of the Old Testament, which are cited in the New, do not agree with the *Greek* of the Septuagint, is because the Evangelists and the Apostles took them from the *Hebrew*, and the Interpreters, Translating them into *Greek*, do not always agree with the Septuagint. But if it were so, those Translators would at least have expressed the *Hebrew* by other *Greek* Words, and would have been conformable to that *Hebrew* : which yet is not true, for they agree more often with the Septuagint, than with the *Hebrew* Text. This difference, as it has been elsewhere observed, proceeds from this, that the Apostles according to the usage of their time, did not trouble themselves in their citations to relate the express Words of Scripture, because they adhered chiefly to the Sense.

But was it necessary (*Salmasius* continues) that St. *Peter*, who was an Apostle of the *Jews*, should understand the *Greek* Language, seeing the *Jews* of that time understood the *Syriack* and the *Hebrew* ? It is not true that all the *Jews* of that time understood the *Hebrew* and the *Syriack*. For in all the *Roman* Empire, only those of *Palestine* knew the *Syriack* or the *Chaldee*, and yet those of that Country who were above the Common Rank, did likewise understand the *Greek* Language. As for the *Hebrew*, there were only a very few Learned Men amongst them who understood it ; whereas the *Greek* Language was spread through a considerable part of the Empire, and the *Jews* of *Rome*, where St. *Peter* was, accompanied with St. *Mark*, spake *Greek* more than any other Language. To that which is objected, that St. *Mark*, according to the testimony of all Antiquity, was St. *Peter*'s Interpreter ; I answer, that it cannot be proved from thence that St. *Peter* was altogether ignorant of the *Greek* Language, seeing all those

(d) *Græcè nescisse Apostolos vel uno vincitur argumento, quod ex Septuaginta Interpretum Versione testimonia non citarint, sed ex Hebraico textu.* Salm. de Hellen. pag. 255.

ancient Doctors of the Church, who make *St. Mark* to be *St. Peter's* Interpreter, do not deny but that this Holy Apostle understood the *Greek*. *St. Paul* had likewise *Titus* for his Interpreter; and yet *Salmasius* thinks that that Apostle knew the *Greek* better than the *Hebrew*.

We will freely grant to this Critick, that *St. John*, who was a *Galilean*, had a more exact knowledge of the *Hebrew*, or rather of the *Chaldaick* Language, than of the *Greek*. But it cannot be from thence inferred with him, that that Apostle did Write his Gospel in the *Hebrew*, rather than in the *Greek*. For having established his abode in the places where the *Greek* was spoken, he instructed the several People whose Apostle he was, in the Language which they spake. And seeing his Gospel is only a Collection of his Sermons, he writ it in the same Language. And therefore I do not apprehend that *Salmasius* has established undoubted Principles for warranting this general Consequence, (e) That the Apostles writ their Books in their Mother-Tongue, which was the *Syriack* Language, and that afterwards they were Translated into *Greek* by the *Syrians*, who understood the *Greek*, or yet by the Converted *Greeks*, whom they used as Coadjutors, and Interpreters for the Preaching of the Gospel. But besides that we have formerly spoken of these Interpreters and Fellow helpers, though they should be acknowledged to have been in the same manner as *Salmasius* does suppose, it might be always said, that the Books of the New Testament are written in the *Greek* of the Synagogue. It is much more probable that the Apostles, who were *Galileans*, are the Authors thereof. For if they had made use of Persons Learned in the *Greek* Language, there would not be found so many *Hebraisms* in them. The Style of *St. John's* Gospel does shew that it was written by a *Galilean*, rather than a *Grecian*.

However it be, *Salmasius* is obliged to declare that the Writings of the New Testament are full of modes of Speech that are altogether *Syriack*: and herein the *Hellenistick* Language is made to consist. He only differs from those whom he calls *Hellenisticaries* (f) in this, that he attributes the form of the *Syriack* Phrases to the Interpreters of the Apostles; whereas the *Hellenisticaries* do ascribe them to the Apostles themselves. But whether it be, that the Apostles themselves, or their Interpreters were the Authors thereof, the thing it self will be always granted. And

(e) *Scribebant igitur Apostoli idiomate suo & linguâ sibi familiari & vernaculâ, quæ protinus à Syris ἑβραϊστικῶν, vel Græcis ipsis ad fidem conversis, quos secum habebant Evangelii prædicandi adiutores & ministros, in Græcum transferebantur.* Salm. ibid. p. 258.

(f) *Illi Syriacini quibus totus conspersus est Novi Testamenti Græci textus ex characterè nimirum ἑβραϊστικῶν, quo de verbo ad verbum expressa peragitur translatio.* Salm. ibid.

thus he does rather establish, than destroy the *Hellenistick* Language.

As for *St. Paul* and *St. Luke*, who understood the *Greek* Language, *Salmasius* does also acknowledge that their Writings are full of *Chaldaisms*: and the Reason that he brings, is, (g) that seeing they understood the *Greek* and the *Chaldee*, they made a mixture of these two Languages. In what manner soever it happened, he cannot deny but that the Language of the Synagogue does appear in the Works of *St. Paul* and of *St. Luke*, as well as in the Writings of the other Apostles. He only thinks that *St. Paul* and *St. Luke* let *Hebraisms* drop more seldom than the Interpreters, who (as he believes) Translated the Books of the other Apostles out of the *Hebrew* and the *Chaldee*, into the *Greek*. Yet *Vorstius*, as I have already observed, has marked more *Hebraisms* in *St. Luke*, than in the other Writers of the New Testament. And therefore it is better to attribute them to the Apostles themselves, if *St. Matthew* be excepted, than to their Fellow Helpers or Interpreters.

For what remains we agree with *Salmasius*, or rather with the *Greek* Fathers, whom he follows in this matter, that the Apostles being rude and destitute of Literature, writ their Books in a very mean Stile, and in a Language that was used by the Dregs of the People. Which in some manner renders their Discourse more intelligible, because that Language does commonly contain nothing that is Figurative as to what concerns the Expressions. We shall observe nevertheless, that altho the Apostles do ordinarily make use of Words that are mean and received amongst the People, and consequently easie to be understood, they have a certain form of Phrase, and certain Expressions which were proper to those of their Nation; which appear sometimes obscure to us, because we know not the usage of that time. Altho their Stile is oftentimes simple and very plain, if we look only to the Grammatical Sense, it is hard enough to be understood, when we intend to reach the true Sense of their Thoughts. The *Jews* had then ways of Expressing themselves, very different from those that are in use amongst us: And in this, the obscurity of the Books of the N. Testament doth chiefly consist.

They who Translate those Books into another Language, ought especially to take care to keep as close as possible to the Words of the Original. For when they endeavour to render the bare Sense, without adhering to the Words, they run a risque of deceiving themselves, and making their Author speak those things which he never thought of. *Beza* and *Castalio* had great Disputes about this. The former alledged, that in Translating the New Testament several *Hebraisms* ought to be retained, because it is impossible to render them exactly in another

(g) Quod de Paulo & Lucâ licet asserere, qui utriusque linguæ periti, in eam quâ scripserunt ex alterâ phrasen & genera loquendi transfuderunt. Salin. ibid.

Language. Further, (b) seeing those *Hebraisms* are capable of various renditions, it is more to the purpose to keep them, than to Interpret them in a Sense which may possibly be false; and withal deprive others of their liberty of judgment concerning them. *Castalio*, on the contrary, was of Opinion that an Interpreter ought to content himself to mark the *Hebraisms* by Notes on the Margin. We shall have occasion to speak more fully of those *Hebraisms* in the second Book of this History, when we examin the several Versions of the New Testament.

(b) *Cum sæpe multiplex sit ratio Hebraismos explicandi, quis non videt rectius & religiosius eos facere qui intactos illos & integros sinunt, quam qui suam opinionem secuti, nullum conjecturæ aut privati judicii locum lectoribus relinquunt.* Bez. Resp. ad Def. Cast.

CHAP. XXIX.

Of the Manuscript Greek Copies in general, and of those who have spoken of them. Collections which have been made of divers Readings drawn from those Manuscripts. Observations upon the whole Matter. The Hereticks have been accused sometimes, but without any ground, for corrupting the Books of the New Testament.

ALtho there have been many Learned Criticks in the *Greek Church*; who applied themselves to correct the Books of the New Testament, we do not see, that any one *Greek Copy* has been altogether preferred to others, that it might be followed by all the *Greek Churches*. Which was the occasion that there was a great difference observed in the various Copies that were in several Churches. *Origen*, who was a very knowing person in this matter, (a) has observed, this great diversity of the *Greek Copies*, which he attributed partly to the negligence of the Transcribers, and partly to the liberty that Criticks assumed, in correcting the Books of the New

(a) Πολλὴ γίγνεται ἡ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορὰ, εἴτε βαρυμίας πῶν γραφῶν, εἴτε ἀπὸ τέλει πῶν μοχθηρῶν ἢ διορθώσεως τῶν γραφῶν, εἴτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκούντων ἐν τῇ διορθώσει περιδιόντων καὶ ἀφαιρούντων. Orig. tom. 15. Comm. in Matth.

Testament, adding to, and taking away from it, according as they judged it convenient. Indeed, if it be remembered what was briefly said of it, upon the occasion of the last Chapter of *S. Mark*, and of the History of the adulterous Woman, Chap. 8. of *S. John*, we shall find evident proofs there of this observation of *Origen*: which would further appear, if we had several Copies of that time, which we might compare with those that remain, whereas we have very few that are above a thousand years continuance; and which, as we shall shew in the next Chapter, do very much differ from those others we have at this day. They have likewise all those Errors that we have observed.

That Father does add, in the same place, that he had in some sort remedied the diversity of the *Greek* Copies of the Septuagint Version, which he had revised and corrected according to the ordinary Rules of Criticism. He likewise declares in what manner he had gone through that great Work, that had all the success that he could hope for. But he did not the like as to the Books of the New Testament, unless it be that he carefully searched for the most correct Copies, and made many Critical Reflections on sundry places, according as occasions did present themselves for that purpose. Neither do we find that the Ecclesiastical Writers, who lived after *Origen*, made a distinction of two sorts of Editions of the New Testament, as they have of two Editions of the Version of the Septuagint. They made a difference betwixt that which was called *versio vulgar*, which was publicly used, and that which was corrected according to the Rules of Criticism. They considered this latter as the true Edition of the Septuagint, altho it was as yet very imperfect, and the most part of the Oriental Churches made use of it for correcting their Copies.

Yet for all this, *Origen* as well as several other Criticks did correct some *Greek* Copies of the New Testament, and *S. Jerom* does sometimes cite them. But it does not appear that his Critical Observations were in the place of a Law, as to those Books, as they were as to an ancient *Greek* Version of the Old Testament. If it had been so, we should have had a Massore of the *Greek* Text of the Writings of the Evangelists and the Apostles, in the same manner as the *Jews* had of the *Hebrew* Text of the Bible. We should not find so many different Readings as there are at this day. For every one would have exactly followed *Origen's* Copy, as the *Jews* followed the Copy that was corrected by their Doctors, whom they commonly called Massorets. And from hence it is that we find not at this day any ancient *Hebrew* Copies of the Scripture amongst them. For they reformed them all by the Massore: and seeing they hold it for infallible, they wholly neglected

neglected their ancient Books. They are so much persuaded, that the Books of the Law which they now read, are perfectly conformable to the Original of *Moses*, that they do keep in their Synagogues any old Roll or Volume. The *Jews* of the *Portuguese* Synagogue of *Amsterdam* have at least fifty Rolls of their *Sepher tora*, or *Book of the Law*, which, for the most part, are very well written, but they are all new. If any ask for ancient ones, they take no notice, because they are prepossessed with a Belief, that there can be no difference betwixt the ancient and the modern.

It is not so amongst the Christians who have had no *Massorets*, whom they altogether follow in copying their *Greek* Copies of the New Testament. And therefore we ought not to be surpris'd, to find therein a much greater number of various Renditions than in the *Hebrew* Copies of the *Jews*. I dare also be bold to say, that this manifold variety ought to gain a greater authority to them, than if there had been no such difference. For it is impossible, that a Book which has passed through so many hands should always continue the same, unless they have corrected it, and afterwards follow exactly that Correction, as it happened to the *Jews*, in respect of the *Hebrew* Text of the Old Testament. It is the advantage of a Book, that there have been several different Copies thereof, to the end that a better Judgment may be given of the true Rendition. And upon this account, the Books of the New Testament are to be preferred to the most part of the others, because the Christian Religion having spread into so many different Countries, every Nation has Copies and Versions thereof.

These are the different Copies by which we are to be guided at this day, because we have not now the first Original. We shall with all possible exactness examine the *Greek* Manuscript Copies, and also the most ancient Versions which have been taken from the *Greek*. We are not to depend upon one *Greek* Edition more than upon another, if it be not founded on better Manuscripts. We shall prefer the Editions which, together with the Text, do contain divers Renditions of sundry Copies. It is a rare thing to find *Greek* Manuscripts where such variations are noted in the Margin; for seeing those Books are read in the Churches, they observe commonly no other Reading than what is authorised by custom. They did content themselves to mark them in distinct Works, especially in the Notes which they joyned to the *Greek* Text of the New Testament. And therefore besides the various Manuscript Copies, we ought to consult the Notes which it is easie enough to find in good Libraries.

Many

Many Learned Criticks of the latter Days, when the Study of the Greek Language was re-established, applied themselves carefully to this Labor. *Valla* was the first who made search for the Greek Copies of the New Testament, and also for the *Latin*. He cites many of them in his Remarks which *Erasmus* took care to Print at *Basle*; and altho he does much insist upon the little Niceties of the *Latin* Grammar, yet we are obliged to him for the new Discoveries which he has made to us in a time when Barbarity did still reign in *Europe*. It was by the force of his Example, that *Erasmus* was induced to write Notes on the New Testament, where he cites a much greater number of *Greek* and *Latin* Manuscripts which he had read. There is also annexed to some Editions of his New Testament a Collection of divers Readings taken from the *Greek* Copies. He seemed to be better versed than *Valla*, in this sort of Reasoning, especially as to his knowledge of Manuscripts. Nevertheless his Critical Reflections do speak the Author's liberty more than their own evidence. When he meets with *Greek* Manuscripts agreeable to the *Latin*, he does judge that the former were corrected by the latter. He thinks, for example, that the *English Greek* Copy, where we read, Epist. I. of *S. John*, chap. 5. vers. 7. of the Testimony of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, (b) was reformed by the *Greeks* themselves, according to the *Latin* Edition, since the Reconciliation of those two Churches. But he will never be able to prove this. Besides, the places which he alledges to have been corrected, have no relation to the Disputes that were betwixt the *Greeks* and the *Latins*. To which we may add, that the *Greeks* were never greater enemies to the *Latins* than since their Reconciliation in the Council of *Florence*. The most part of those who had subscribed to that Council, were hardly well returned home, when they assembled at *Constantinople*, where they protested against all that they had done at *Florence*. The Record of that Protestation is yet extant, with the Names of those who subscribed it.

We cannot enough admire, *Robert Stephen's* Fair Edition of the New Testament in *Greek*, in *Folio*, wherein he gives us proofs of his Learning, and of his Judgment. The Cardinal *Ximenes*, to whom we are obliged for his first Edition of the New Testament, had made a search into good Manuscript Copies; but he has not marked in the Margin of his Edition, the various renditions of those Copies, having only kept in the Text that which he judged to be the

(b) *Ad Latinorum codices fuisse castigatum. Posteaquam enim Græci concordiam inierunt cum Ecclesiâ Romanâ, studuerunt & hac in parte cum Romanis consentire. Erasmi. Apol. adv. Jac. Lop. Stun.*

best. *Stephen* has wisely redressed this fault. For he has placed the various Readings of six Manuscript Copies, in the Margin of his Edition, and thus, though he commonly follows the Edition of *Ximenes* in his Text, he is not obliged to adhere to it, unless he were persuaded, that the renditions of the Cardinal's Copy are the best in those places. It is no great matter for a Reading to be inserted in the Body of a Book, or to be placed in the Margin, provided that it be known that those which are in the Margin are taken from good Manuscript Copies, as well as those which are in the Text. It were also much to be desired, for observing a greater uniformity, that those who have published new Editions of the New Testament in *Greek*, had all of them exactly followed the *Alcala*, or the *Complutum* Edition, which is the first, and that they had contented themselves to refer to the Margin the various Readings of their Manuscripts.

Yet *Beza* has produced a greater number of different Readings in several Copies of the N. T. than *Robert Stephen* has done. But he has only observed them in his Notes which are full of things that serve to no purpose, whereas he ought to have placed them, after *Stephen's* example, in the Margin of the *Greek* Text. Neither has he marked all of them, that he might not give offence to those who were weak amongst his Party, who would not have had so great a Veneration for the Word of God, if they had observed so great a number of various Readings. He declares, that (c) he was indebted for the greatest part of those Manuscripts to *Henry Stephen*, from whom he had a Copy that had been compared with twenty five Manuscripts, and with the most part of those that were Printed. He had besides that, a very ancient Copy, whereof he makes mention in his Notes, the first part of which is yet extant, (containing the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles) reserved in *Cambridge*, and the second part, in which the Epistles of *St. Paul* are comprehended in the King's Library. We shall examin in the following Chapter, that ancient Manuscript with which *Beza* was not well enough acquainted.

The *English* have inserted in the sixteenth Tome of their Polyglott Bible, a larger Collection taken from the different Manuscript Copies of the New Testament, than any had been before that time. They likewise joyned thereto, the observations of some Learned Criticks upon this matter, and amongst others, that of *Luke of Bruges*. Which cleared the thing very much. For a single Catalogue of divers rendi-

(c) *Ad hæc omnia accessit exemplar ex Stephani nostri Bibliotheca cum viginti quinque plus minus manuscriptis codicibus, & omnibus penè impressis ab Henrico Stephano ejus filio & paternæ sedulitatis herede quam diligentissimè collatum.*
Bez. in Epist. dedic. ad Elizab. Angl. Reg.

tions is not sufficient. They are also all in a considerable error, who have published the different Readings of the Manuscript Copies which they consulted. They have not been at the pains to examin those Manuscripts particularly, and to observe the good and the evil qualities thereof. Which frequently happens, because they who produce those Collections, have not themselves read those Manuscripts. Seeing they commonly depend upon the Credit of those whom they employed in that Work, which is very troublesom, their Collections are not always exact.

The New Testament Printed at Oxford in octavo, ought to be preferred to all other Editions, because it contains a greater variety than any we have as yet seen upon it. There is moreover this advantage, that these various renditions are at once joyned to the Text. But seeing they have hardly done any thing else in that Collection, but Compiled that which had been Printed before that time, they have not Corrected the faults that were in other Collections with that care that was requisite, but on the contrary have encreased them to a far greater number. It would be to no purpose to give examples in this place, of those errors, because I am informed that they intend to publish a new Greek Edition of the New Testament, which will be more ample than the former, which must needs be very useful, if it chance to be well done.

Stephen Courcel caused to Print the New Testament in Greek, with a considerable Collection of various Readings, which had formerly been in the Possession of Elzevir. He has only marked the Varieties, without mentioning of the Manuscript Copies whence they are taken. Which renders his Work the less perfect, seeing he did content himself to point at them in his Preface. He had an intention to put forth a larger Edition (*d*) to which he promised to joyn the Latin Text of the Vulgar, to the various Readings of the different Latin Copies: but it did not appear that he was so good as his Word. For there was published a new Edition of that New Testament, which differed in nothing from the former, unless it was that they writ under every particular Page, some Varieties, that had been separately Printed in the first Edition, at the end of the Acts of the Apostles, and of the Epistles of St. Paul.

If Mr. Saubert had continued on the Books of the Old Testament, that which he did upon St. Matthew's Gospel, that Work had been as considerable as any that has been done as yet. For besides all the various Readings of the Greek Copies, he has observed those

(d) In quâ si Deus dederit ut eam aliquando adornare vacet, Vulgatam Versionem Latinam unâ cum variantibus ejus lectionibus aliaque ejus generis plura adjungere meditamur. Curc. Præf. N. T.

which may be taken from several Versions, or which confirm those various renditions. He has also added some Critical Notes by way of illustration; in which he appeared to be exact, although he is mistaken in some Passages. It is a matter of difficulty for one Man to perform a Work of that importance; seeing it does require that he himself should read all the Manuscripts: which is impossible. So one must be obliged to depend upon the Authority of other Men. Nevertheless that Critick has observed some errors that are in *Walton's* Collections; and he prefixed a learned Preface to his Work that was Printed at *Helmstat*, where he discourses judiciously of the various *Greek* Copies of the New Testament, and of the different renditions.

In 1672.

I might produce several other Authors who have treated of this same Subject. But seeing the most part have only done it occasionally, I will refer it to another place, where there will be occasion to speak something of their Works. I will only here make mention of those who have spoken of various *Greek* Readings which establish the ancient Latin Version. *Beza*, who did not spare that ancient Version, was obliged to acknowledg (e) that there were sometimes *Greek* Copies more exact, than those which we have at present. (f) He does alledge, that *Erasmus* did sometimes reject the ancient Latin Interpreter, without any shew of Reason, under a pretence that it did very little agree with the *Greek*. Which is true, saith *Beza*, if we only consider the New *Greek* Copies. But that Interpreter does agree with other more ancient *Greek* Copies. Upon this ground it would seem, that the Protestants do not always act with Reason, when they forsake the ancient Latin Edition, and adhere to the *Greek* at this day. *Beza* himself, who owned this fault in the Version of *Erasmus*, is not yet free from the same himself. Not but that he believes that those ancient Manuscripts ought always to be preferred to others: for there is none but the Original of the Apostles alone, which can admit of this perfection. They pretend only to prove thereby, that those who made New Translations of the New Testament from the *Greek*, were not always exact in their Versions, because they only consulted a very small number of *Greek*

(e) *Aliquot locis animadvertimus veteris interpretis lectionem, quamvis cum nostris Græcis exemplaribus interdum ei non conveniat, tamen ipsis rebus multò melius quadrare, nempe quòd ille quisquis fuit emendatius aliquod exemplar nactus est.* Bez. Epist. ad Regin. Eliz.

(f) *Quàm immeritò (Erasmus) multis veterem interpretem reprehendit tanquam à Græcis dissentientem? Dissentiebat fateor ab iis exemplaribus quæ ille nactus erat; sed non uno loco comperimus aliorum codicum, & quidem vetustissimorum auctoritate eam interpretationem niti quam ille reprehendit.* Bez. ibid.

Editions, whereas they ought to have likewise consulted several Manuscript Copies, which afforded a great many Readings.

Peter Faxard a Noble Spanish Marquess of *Veles*, was the first who was at the pains to make this sort of Collections, of which we now treat. *Mariana* does assure us, that (g) that Marquess had compared sixteen Greek Manuscripts, with our Vulgar Edition: Eight of these Manuscripts were in the King of Spain's Library. And he had carefully mark'd in the Margin of a Greek Copy of the New Testament, the various Readings of those Manuscripts, upon which the Ancient Latin Edition is Founded; as to those places in which it does not agree with the Greek at this day. But that which was wanting to so laudable a Work, and which could not be sufficiently valued, is, that the Copies whence those various Readings had been taken, were not pointed out. *Mariana*, who had not seen those Manuscripts, does nevertheless say, that they were, for the most part Ancient: This was, in all probability the only Remark, which the Marquess of *Veles* had made upon the Quality of his Manuscripts. This Jesuit, who had transcribed the Marquess's Copy, in which those various Readings were recorded, (b) made a present thereof to *Lacerda* of the same Society, who published them in his Book Entitled, *Adversaria Sacra*; and they were afterwards inserted in many Collections of divers Readings of the New Testament.

Father *Morin* did likewise insert in his Exercitations upon the Bible, the various Readings of some Greek Copies of the New Testament, in the places that confirm our Latin Version. He pretends that he had shewn the conformity of the vulgar to the ancient Greek Manuscripts, in more than 440 places: *Conformitatem illam Vulgatæ cum vetustissimis Exemplaribus ---- in locis plusquam 440 Demonstramus.* He made it his business to mark, especially those of the Cambridge Copy, upon the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, and he followed, upon the Epistles of St. Paul, the Copy which *Beza* calls *Claromontanum*, of *Clermont*: Seeing his design was to prove to the

(g) *Ad Novi Testamenti Græci exteriorem marginem minio varias lectiones sua manu suoque labore 16. codicum factâ collatione, in quibus octo erant ex Regiâ Bibliothecâ D. Laurentii, plerique vetustate insignes, adjecerat Petrus Fagiardus Veleſius Marchio. Ingens theſaurus magnopere æſtimandus, ſi vir ille optimus & Græcæ linguæ præſtans, quibus ex libris ſingulæ lectiones eſſent depromptæ noſſet. Mar. pro Edit. Vulg. c. 17.*

(h) *Dono Reverendiſſimi Joannis Mariana à Societate noſtrâ habeo exemplar Novi Testamenti, in quo variæ lectiones ſunt manu transcriptæ exceptæ ex exemplari, quas item manu propriâ adnotarat illuſtriſſimus Marchio Veleſius Petrus Faxardus, factâ collatione 16. exemplarium, in quibus erant octo ex Bibliothecâ Regiâ D. Laurentii. Lacerd. Advèrſ. Sac. c. 91.*

Protestants, that there was a great number of various Readings, as well in the Old, as in the New Testament; he could not, upon the New, make choice of any Books, in which there was more to be found than in those two Books. He likewise does add some Notes, for the illustration of this matter; and after having produced a sufficient number of those various Readings, which established the vulgar, he concludes, (i) that the Protestants are to blame, for that they frequently follow, in their Versions, the vulgar Edition of the *Hebrew* Text, against the Authority of the Manuscript Copies, although they themselves do cite these Manuscripts. He brings for an Example, *Beza's* Translation, who, in several places, has preferred this vulgar Edition of the *Greek* Text to his Ancient Manuscript Copies. He does observe withal, that *Robert Stephen* has also left out of his *Greek* Edition of the New Testament, many Readings which are not agreeable to any of the Manuscripts which he does produce: And yet the Protestants, in their Translations of the New Testament, choosed rather to follow *Robert Stephen*, than the various Readings of the Manuscripts, which he had mark'd in the Margin of his Edition. There would have been nothing which deserved reprehension, in that, if the Protestants in their Versions, had imitated *Stephen's* Method in his *Greek* New Testament. For if they had placed the Translation of all those various Renditions, in the Margin of their Works, they could not have been accused for preferring the *Greek* Vulgar Edition to the Ancient Manuscripts. They would have only placed in the body of their Translations, that Edition which they believed to be the most exact, to the end that they might observe some uniformity amongst themselves, without any prejudice done to other Examples upon that account.

The care that Father *Amelote* took, to insert in his *French* Version of the New Testament, the various Readings of the Manuscript Copies, which are agreeable to the ancient Latin Interpreters, deserves to be praised. But he offends against Modesty, and even against Truth, when he speaks of those *Venerable and August Manuscripts*, which he pretends to have examined with such exactness, as the like was never seen before. *I have* (saith he) *used such diligence, that there has not been the like heard of before, to shew the conformity of the Latin, with the Ancient Greek and the first Original, I have narrowly examined all the Manuscripts extant for above these thousand years,*

P. Amel.
Pref.
Franc. de
sa Vers.
du Nouv.
Test.

(i) *Plurimis in locis testantur in omnibus antiquis codicibus aliter legi quam in vulgato textu Græco. Ipsi tamen in versionibus suis contra omnium exemplarium fidem textum Græcæ semel excusum amplectuntur, & ad illum in omni omnibus codicibus MSS. versiones exigunt.* Jo: Mor. Exercit. lib. 1. Exerc. 2. cap. 4.

which

which are kept through all the Christian World, and I have obtained extracts of them all. I have had more than twenty of that sort from France; all those of the Vatican, and the famous Italian Libraries; sixteen from Spain, not to reckon others, with which Cardinal Ximenes used to perfect his Bible of Alcala; those of England and the Northern Countries, and many from the innermost Parts of Greece, with those that belonged to the several Fathers.

There is none who reads those Words but would believe, that that Father had in his hands all those Copies whereof he makes mention, at least the Extracts of the Manuscripts. But all that long Discourse is only a Rhetorical flourish which he uses, that the Subject of which he treats of may be embellished with a noble expression, according to the lofty Idea which he had of it. And this he avowed to one of his Fraternity, to whom he shewed his Preface in Writing, and who advised him to amend it, especially in that place where he makes mention of his Manuscripts. He made no other Answer about it, to his Brother, who at the same time shew'd him those various Readings in Print, but, that the subject matter required, that he should express himself in a noble manner, to make the greater impression in the minds of those who read his Works. So that all those Venerable and August Manuscripts, which *F. Amelote* consulted are nothing else but a Figure of Rhetorick.

Indeed, if he had made such an exact scrutiny into those Manuscripts, he ought to have told us another story than what is found in the Catalogues, that have been Printed of them. It is true, that he writ into *Spain*, to know what had become of those that belonged to the Marquês of *Veles*. * The Archbishop of *Ambrun*, the French Ambassador, then at that Court, who was one of his Friends, made him Answer, that he had no account at *Madrid*, of the Manuscripts of that Marquês. He continued the same Rhetorical Figure, when he would persuade us, that he obtained Copies of many various readings by the means of his Friends; For he shew'd nothing of that nature, but what was contained in the Sixth Volume of the Polyglott of *England*, or in *Lacerda* the Jesuit, or in *F. Morin*. It was by the assistance of the latter, that he framed a design of collecting the various Readings that establish the ancient Latin Edition: It were easie to let him see, by his own words, that he did not very well understand that sort of Criticism. He was so far from having all the Extracts of the Manuscript mentioned by him, that it seems, that he had not the skill to read the Catalogues of those Manuscripts perfectly. For I would fain know, what he meant by the two Manuscripts of *Magdebourg* College in *Oxford*, which he mentions in the two Prefaces to his *French* New Testament. He had read in the

* Mr.
d' Au-
bureau.

Catalogue of Manuscripts, Printed in the Sixth Volume of the Polyglott of England, *Magd. 1. Novum Testamentum integrum, excepta Apocalypsi, in Collegio Magd. Oxon.* Further, *Magd. 2. Epistola ad Rom. & Corinth. cum acum. Colleg. Oxon.* All the World knows, that this abbreviation *Coll. Magd. Oxon.* does denote *Magdalen College in Oxford.* But *F. Amelote*, who used such diligence, that we have not heard of the like before, does give us two Manuscripts of the New Testament, which are extant in *Magdeburg College in Oxford*; and if we believe him, he had the Copies thereof extracted. You may see in what manner he marks them in his Latin Preface *Magd. 1. Magdeburgensis Collegii apud Oxonium Novum Testamentum integrum, excepta Apocalypsi. Magd. 2. Magdeburgensis Collegii Codex Epistolarum ad Romanos & ad Corinthios*; which he repeats in his French Preface: Seeing we shall have occasion in the Second Part of this Book, to speak of the French Version of this Father, I shall there treat of his Collection of the various Readings.

It was easie for *Mr. Arnauld* to refute him upon this Subject, in his *New defence of the Translation of the New Testament, Printed at Mons.* I could only have wished that he had not reckon'd as Chimerical, that which *F. Amelote*, and after him *Mr. Mallet*, call the *Vulgar Greek*, that is to say, for the explaining of the *Vulgar Edition* of the *Greek Text* of the New Testament. It is true, that these two Authors had a false notion of this *Vulgar Greek*; but that does not hinder, but that they might very well have used that expression, when they compared the ordinary Editions of the *Greek New Testament*, with the various Readings of many Ancient Manuscripts. And in this sense, they gave the appellation of *κωινω* or *Vulgar*, to the Ancient *Greek Edition* of the *Septuagint*, which was in every ones hands, to distinguish it from *Origen's* corrected Copy. It may be also said upon good grounds, that this *Vulgar Greek* was altered in sundry places, and that therefore it is not justifiable, that we should forsake the *Vulgar*, whenever it does not agree with the *Vulgar Greek*. Upon this ground *Mariana* the Jesuit observed, that it is not likely, that the Ancient Latin Interpreter is the Author of all the various Readings, that make so great a difference betwixt the *Greek* and the *Latin*. *Neque enim tam multis locis, quibus à Græcis Latina discrepant, de suo capite sibiisse verisimile est.* (k) He thinks that that Interpreter, in making his Version, followed the best Copies of his time,

(k) *Susplicabar ex variis olim codicibus eam lectionem fuisse secutum, eosque codices qui communi eruditorum sententiâ eâ etate maximè probabantur ex alio quopiam uno aut paucis minoris fidei transfusos Græcos codices qui nostrâ etate formis expressi vulgò circumferuntur.* Mar. pro Edit. Vulg. c. 17.

and that those which have been Printed in this last Age, were taken from a very few Copies, which were not very correct.

According to this Observation, the *Greek* of the New Testament may be called, as it was Printed, a *Vulgar Greek*, if it be compared with the Ancient Manuscripts, which the Latin Interpreter made use of, and yet for all that, those Manuscripts ought not to have the denomination of the *Apostolical Greek*, and of the first Original. F. Morin has also given it the name of the *Vulgar Greek*, or that which has been published in our time. *Cogitent ergo* (saith he to the Protestants, who are very apt to leave the Ancient Latin Edition) *quoties Vulgatam à Græco Vulgato dissentientem deprehendunt, sed cum vetustissimis codicibus esse consensum, à quibus degeneres sunt neoterici Græci.*

It is moreover a long time, since this difference has been observed in the *Greek* Copies of the New Testament, which is founded upon the Rules of Criticism. The appellation of *Vulgar* has been always given to the common Copies of the Bible, to distinguish them from those that were corrected by Criticks, and are therefore believed to be more exact. The *Jews* for example, reform their common and ordinary Copies by those of the *Massoret*. Hilarius Deacon of Rome puts a great value on this Rule, in his Commentary upon the fifth Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*, v. 14. He rejects the *Vulgar* Reading of the *Greek* Copies, assuring us, that they can never be used so as to prevail against the Latin Edition, seeing they vary. *Sic præscribitur nobis*, (saith he) *de Græcis codicibus quasi non ipsi ab invicem discrepent.* He has recourse to the most Ancient *Greek* Copies, from which the Latin Version was taken. And seeing (1) he is perswaded that the Latin Copies were not corrupted, he believes, that the *Greek* from which they were taken is ancient and true.

F. Amelose, might according to this sense, have distinguished the *Greek* at this day, from the ancient and true *Greek*, and have called the former the *Vulgar Greek*. But it does not follow from thence, that that Ancient *Greek* is free from all faults, and that it must be always preferred to the *Greek* which is called New. For this latter *Greek* is no otherwise New, but in respect of its being published in these latter times. And it may happen, that this New *Greek* may be found agreeable to the most Ancient Authors, and that it is conse-

(1) *Constat autem hoc per quosdam Latinos de veteribus Græcis olim translatis codicibus, quos incorruptos simplicitas temporum servavit & servat.* Ambrosiast. Comm. in Epist. ad Rom. c. 5. v. 14.

Ambros.
ibid.

quently very ancient. And therefore *Hilarus* the Deacon gives us three Qualities, the consideration of which ought to induce us to prefer one Copy to another. *Hoc verum arbitror*, (saith he) *quando & Ratio & Historia & Autoritas observatur*: He grounds the Reading, which he believes to be the best in that place, upon the Authority of *Tertullian*, of *Victorin*, and *St. Cyprian*. Whence he does conclude, that the *Vulgar Greek* of his time was not to be followed, seeing there were more ancient and more true Copies, in which the Reading was otherwise. I do not inquire, if that Deacon was justifiable in the matter of which he treated: I content my self with proposing the Rule that he gives us, by which we may distinguish the Copies that are called *Vulgar* or *Common*, from others that are more *Ancient* and more *Correct*.

This being once supposed, we shall avoid many unprofitable Questions, which *Mr. Arnould* does seriously handle, upon the occasion of the *Vulgar Greek*, which he alleges to be extant in notation only, and which (saith he) we ought first to make, before we speak of it. This Learned Man does afterwards endeavour to prove, that that name is neither to be given to *Robert Stephen's* Edition, nor to that of the *Cardinal Ximenes*, nor to any other, because, (as he thinks) it is *Chimerical*, and of *F. Amelote's* invention, who framed to himself a certain *Vulgar Greek*, the most erroneous that could be imagined, in opposition to the *Vulgar*, that the faults of the one might ballance the perfections of the other. I am apt to believe, that that Father does entertain false Idea's of that which is called the *Vulgar Greek*? But if he be understood in the manner we have already shewn, it is no *Chimera* nor fancy. If the Authors of the Translation of the New Testament, Printed at *Mons*, have sometimes followed the *Vulgar Greek* in their Version, without making mention of any other *Greek*, they are in that to be blamed: For it cannot be absolutely affirmed, that the *Greek* is read in some places, otherwise than the *Latin*, when there are *Greek* Copies where the Reading is the same with the *Latin*: Neither must we always prefer the *Greek* Copies that agree with the *Latin* Edition, to the *Common* and *Ordinary*. We are to judge of those Readings according to the Rules of Criticism, and examin with the Deacon *Hilary*; which of those Copies are Founded on Reason, on History, and on Authority. The *Greek* wherein these things do meet, shall be the most ancient and the most correct, whether it be found in the Old Manuscripts, or in the Printed Books.

There is then nothing more false, than the Idea that School Divines, and some Canonists have formed, of the *Greek* Copies of the
New

New Testament. For under the pretence of defending the Authority of the Ancient Latin Edition, they alledge, that when there is any difference betwixt the *Greek* Copies at this day and the Latin, we ought always to prefer the Latin to the Greek; because the *Greeks* (say they) being Schismaticks have corrupted their Books, whereas the Truth has remained in the *Roman* Church; there is nothing more unjust than this thought; For it is easie to go back to the time before the Schism, and to shew that the *Origen's*, the *Chrysostom's*, and several other Fathers of that Church had the Reading in their Copies, in the same manner as these have it, whom at this day we call Schismaticks.

This most unjust accusation is nevertheless very Ancient: So soon as ever there is a difference perceived in Copies, if this difference do favour the Opinions of some Party, they will be sure to accuse that Party of corrupting the Sacred Writings, although that difference does for the most part come from the Transcribers. *Hilary* the Deacon has made a general Rule, in that place formerly mentioned: He assures us, (m) that the Spirit of dispute, that is betwixt different Parties is the cause of different Renditions. Every one (saith he) seeing he cannot on such occasions, justify himself by his own Authority, does corrupt the Words of the Law, that he may make his own Opinions pass for the Words of the Law.

Although that has happened sometimes, especially to those ancient Hereticks of whom we spake in the beginning of this Work, I am perswaded, that they have frequently attributed to different Parties, such various Renditions in the Copies of the New Testament, as had no other cause Originally, but what those have which are found in all other Books. How many Divines are there, for example, who believe at this day, that they have taken away from the Ancient *Greek* Copies, the Testimony of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; of which mention is made in the first Epistle of St. *John*, Chap. 5. v. 7. to favour the *Arian* Heresie. Others, on the contrary do alledge, that it was the *Arians* who added these Words expressly to the *Greek* Text, to shew, the Unity of the Persons of the Trinity is not an Unity of Essence, but of Consent. *Grotius* is of this latter Opinion:

(m) Quod fecit studium contentiōnis. Quia enim propriā quis auctoritate usi non potest ad victoriā, verba legis adulterat, ut sensum suum quasi verba legis asserat, ut non ratio, sed auctoritas præscribere videatur. Ambros. ibid.

He thinks (n) that the *Arians*, for this reason, were so far from retrenching some Words from the Text, that they added some thereunto: that, on the contrary, the Catholicks had taken away that which is said of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, leaving only these Words, *These three are the same*; which can do them no hurt, and which (as he thinks) were likewise added by the *Arians*. But all this is only founded on Conjectures: and seeing every one does reason according to his Prejudices, some will have the *Arians* to be the Authors of that Addition, and others do attribute the same to the Catholicks. This diversity of Opinions proceeds from nothing else but a neglect of examining with sufficient care, the ancient Manuscript Copies and other Records which were necessary for the discovery of the Original of those Variations. It would be to no purpose for me to repeat here the Critical Reflections which I have formerly made on that Passage of the first Epistle of St. *John*, it having been made evident in what manner it came to pass that those Words, that were neither in the *Greek* Copies nor in the *Latin*, were inserted in the Text.

No credit therefore is easily to be given to all those Accusations of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers against the Hereticks, upon the point of the Alterations that have happened to the Sacred Writings. We have already seen, in the Critical History of the Old Testament, that the most part of the Fathers did cast the same reproach on the *Jews*, without any ground. Seeing the most part of Heresies sprung up in the *Greek* Church, those who maintain the preference of the *Latin* Copies of the New Testament, do not fail to bring this Reason, to shew that the Books of the *Latins* are more ancient than those of the *Greeks*. But before this Accusation is brought, it ought to be examined if these Objections have a good foundation: for if the thing be considered in general, the Original must needs be more perfect than the Versions, unless it be in some places, where it may be demonstrated that the Version is instead of the Original which has been altered.

The Sect of the *Macedonians* were at another time accused, as being the Authors of the Word *ἄγιος* Chap. vii. of St. *John*, v. 39. where we read, *ὁ πατήρ ὁ μόνος ἀγιος*, *The Holy Ghost was not as yet*;

(n) Neque verò Arianis ablatas esse voces quasdam, sed potius additas, unde colligerent Patrem & Filium & Spiritum Sanctum non esse unum nisi consensu, quomodo spiritus, aqua & sanguis in unum testimonium consentiunt. Quod cum viderent Catholici, abstulisse quidem illud quod de Patre, Filio & Spiritu Sancto insertum fuerat, sed reliquisse illud, tres unum esse, quia id ita positum nocere non poterat. Grot. Annot. in 1. Epist. Joann. c. 5. v. 7.

whereas

whereas it is in the Vulgar, *For the Holy Ghost was not yet given*. The ancient *Latin* Interpreter did not read the Word *ἅγιος* in his *Greek* Copy; which is likewise wanting in some *Greek* Manuscripts, and in others belonging to Mr. *Colbert's* most ancient Library. Neither is it extant in the *Syriack* Version: which makes me believe that it was added, and that it was not in the first *Original Greek*. But it must not be inferred from hence, that those who favoured the Party of *Macedonius* were the Authors of that Addition, there being the like Examples in other places, with which they cannot be charged. It is much more probable, that it was occasion'd by the *Greek* Scholiasts, who placed the Word *ἅγιος* in the Margin, to shew that that place spake of the Holy Spirit, and it passed into the Text afterwards.

*Cod. MSS.
Bibl. Coll.
n. 5149.*

There is also in the same Passage the *Latin* Word *datus*, which is not read in the *Greek*, unless it be in the ancient Copy of the *Vatican*, where there is, according to *Lewis of Bruges*, *δεδωκεν*. It is very likely that this Word was added by the *Latin* Interpreter, who had in his view the sense of that Passage where the Gifts of the Holy Ghost are spoken of. It would be likewise added after the same manner in the Margin of some *Greek* Copy. We also read in the *Syriack* Version, *was not yet given*; which does wholly agree with the *Latin*: and in the three *Arabick* Versions which have been published, it is in the same sense, *was not yet come*. *Grotius* believed that the *Greek* Word *δεδωκεν*, or as it is in the *Latin*, *datus*, was added for the avoiding the reproach of the Followers of *Macedonius*; *In nonnullis, datus, ad vitandam calumniam Macedoniorum*. But it is not at all necessary that they should have had any regard to those Sectaries to induce them to add that Word, seeing they only explained the sense of the *Greek* Verb, *ἦν* *was*, which in this place is not taken substantively. *Jansenius* Bishop of *Gand*, who had read in all the *Greek* Copies, *ἔτι καὶ ὁ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, for the Spirit was not yet*, did likewise believe, that they had changed the *Greek* Word *ἅγιος* *Holy* into that of *Datus* in the *Latin* Edition, (o) because that sense did then seem to be impious, as if there had been no Holy Ghost as yet.

*Grot. An-
not. in
hunc loc.*

But, as we have observed, Alterations of that kind do happen of themselves, without all those Theological Considerations. When the Words of a Text are equivocal or very general, they are illustrated by Notes; and when this Illustration does consist of a few Words, the Note does easily pass into the Text; which yet happens with

(o) Quoniam ea lectio primâ fronte impium sensum præ se ferebat, quasi scilicet Spiritus aliquando non fuerit; offensus quispiam, ut verisimile est, mutavit illud in *datus*. *Janf. Gand. Concord. Eu. c. 75.*

greater freedom in a Version. *Salmeron's* Sentiment upon this matter appeared to me to be more just than that of *Jansenius* and of *Grotius*. That Jesuit did content himself to say, (p) that there was *Sanctus* instead of *Datus*, in the ancient *Greek* Copies; but that this does make no difference of reading in respect of the sense, because the Word *datus* must of necessity be supplied, although it be not expressed in the *Greek*. Moreover, the true and ancient reading of that Passage in the *Greek* Text was *ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι*, for the Spirit was not as yet: and it was also read in the ancient *Latin* Version, *Nondum enim erat Spiritus*, as it is in some *Latin* Copies. *Luke of Bruges* does observe, that *St. Augustin* did not read it otherwise when he treated expressly of that Passage: and indeed, as this Reading is the most plain, so it appears to be the most natural and the most ancient.

It is requisite that one use great Precaution in reading the ancient Ecclesiastical Authors in those Places where they accuse the Heretics of having corrupted the Sacred Writings, to establish their new Doctrine; for these Accusations are oftentimes groundless. We do not now read, for example, in any *Latin* Copy of the New Testament, Chap. 3. of *S. John's* Gospel, v. 6. these Words, *Quia Deus spiritus est*, for *God is a Spirit*, which *St. Ambrose* had in his Copy, and which apparently was the Gloss of some Catholic; yet that Holy Bishop does mightily exclaim against the *Arians* on the occasion of that Passage: (q) he does accuse them of taking those Words out of their Copies. Would to God (saith he) you had only retrenched them for your own Copies, and not from those of the Church. He is also so punctual in his Accusation, that he marks the time in which he believed that Impiety to have received its Birth; and he is afraid, that the *Greek* Copies of the Eastern Churches have been likewise corrupted after the same manner. You could (he adds speaking to the *Arians*) take away those Words, but you could not abolish the Faith.

If we examine according to Critical Rules, that which *St. Ambrose* does assure us was retrenched by the *Arians* from *St. John's* Text, we

(p) *Græca exemplaria antiqua pro datus habent sanctus, & in sensu nulla est prorsus à nostra lectione diversitas, quia etsi non exprimat verbum datus, supplendum est necessarium.* Salmer. tom. 8. tract. 37.

(q) *Quem locum ita expressè Ariani testificamini esse de Spiritu, ut eum de vestris codicibus auferatis. Atque utinam de vestris, & non etiam de Ecclesiæ codicibus tolleretis. Eo enim tempore quo impiè infidelis Auxentius Mediolanensem Ecclesiam armis exercituque occupaverat, vel à Valente atq; Ursacio nutantibus Sacerdotibus suis incurfabatur, Ecclesia Sirmiensis falsum hoc & sacrilegum in Ecclesiasticis codicibus deprehensum est. Et fortasse hoc etiam in Oriente fecistis, & literas quidem potuistis abolere, sed fidem non potuistis auferre.* Ambr. l. 3. de Spir. San. c. 11.

shall easily judge that it was an Addition of some Catholicks who read in their Copy of the ancient *Latin* Edition, chap. 5. v. 6. of the Gospel of St. *John*, *Quod natum est ex Spiritu, Spiritus est, quia Deus est Spiritus*; which Edition was never publicly approved by any Church. Yet *Fulbert* Bishop of *Chartres* did zealously continue the same Accusation against the *Arian* Party; (r) Because they deny (saith he) the Holy Ghost, they have taken away from the Gospel of St. *John* these words of our Saviour, *The Spirit of God*.

There is yet less probability in the reproachful Charge that *Socrates* has used against the *Nestorians*, for having retrenched from their Copies these words of the first Epistle of St. *John*, chap. 4. v. 3. Πάν πνεῦμα ὃ λέει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔκ ἐστ. *Whatsoever Spirit does divide Christ, is not of God*. He pretends that *Nestorius* knew not that this Reading was founded upon ancient Copies, ἐν τοῖς παλαιαῖς ἀντιγράφοις. (s) Those (saith he) who have separated the Divine from the Humane Nature in Jesus Christ, have taken away these words from their Copies: and therefore the ancient Commentators on the Scripture have observed, that some who would separate the Humanity from the Godhead have corrupted that Epistle. Bishop *Fulbert* did likewise observe in the place lately quoted, (t) that the Hereticks have taken away from St. *John's* Epistle these words, and *whatsoever Spirit does separate Jesus Christ is not of God*; as *Nestorius* and the rest.

But can *Nestorius* and his Followers be accused for authorizing a false Reading, which is at this day in all the *Greek* Copies, and in the *Oriental* Versions, seeing the same Reading is not only found in *S. Cyprian*, but is likewise authorised by *S. Polycarp*, who was contemporary with the Disciples of the Apostles? It cannot be denied but that the other Reading, which is confirmed by the Author of the *Vulgar*, is also very ancient: but it is probable, that it is a Note or Gloss that in process of time passed into the Text. They would explain these words μὴ ὁμολογεῖ does not confess, by this λέγει does separate, the more effectually to refute the ancient Hereticks who denied the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, or who did separate *Jesus* from *Christ*. And upon

(r) *Arii auditores quoniam Spiritum Sanctum Deum esse negabant, de Evangelio eraserunt illud quod Salvator ait, Spiritus est Deus. Fulb. Carnot. Episc. Epist. 1.*

(s) Ταῦτ' αὖτε διάνοιαν ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν ἀντιγράφων ἀμεῖλλον, οἱ χωρίζον ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς οἰκονομίας ἀνθρώπου βελομήσοι καὶ διότρηται. Δὶδ' ἢ οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐμύλωνται αὐτὸ τὸτο ἐπισυνέλιπον, ὥς πνεῦμα εἶεν βελομήσοι καὶ διότρηται, λέγει ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἀνθρώπου θέλοντες. *Socr. Hist. Eccles. lib. 7. c. 32.*

(t) *Et de Epistola Joannis eraserunt, Et omnis spiritus qui solvit Jesum, ex Deo non est, sicut Nestorius, &c. Fulb. Carnot. ibid.*

this

this account it is, that both these Readings are extant in some ancient Fathers, where they are sometimes joined both together. However it be, *Socrates* had no reason to reject the ancient and the true Reading of the *Greek* Text of *S. John*, under a Pretext that the *Nestorians* did believe that it favoured their Opinion. It can only be said, that they are two different Readings of the same Passage, which are very ancient. It cannot be discovered which is the true one, or at least which is to be preferred, unless, for that end, we observe with *Hilary* the Deacon, the Rules of Criticism, which have been already taken notice of.

CHAP. XXX.

Of the Greek Copies of the New Testament in particular.

The most ancient that we have at this day, were written by the Latins, and were used by them. Those which were printed came from the Greek Churches. The ancient Latin Version which was in the Churches of the West before St. Jerom, were made by those first Copies which were not very correct. Of the ancient Cambridge Copy; why it does differ so much from other Greek Copies.

Those who have published the divers Readings of different *Greek* Copies of the New Testament, ought in the same time to have observed what sort of Copies they were. Seeing they have not done this, I shall endeavour to supply this defect, that we may be the more able to judge what are the best Renditions among so many various Readings. In the former Chapter, it was shewn from a Passage of *Origen*, that the *Greek Amanuenses* who wrote out the Books of the New Testament, and likewise the Criticks who corrected them, had assumed a very great liberty; and that that was the occasion of a mighty confusion. *St. Jerom* does confirm the same thing, especially with respect to the ancient *Latin* Copies, in his Letter to *Pope Damasus*, who had commanded him to revise the ancient *Latin* Version.

That

That Father believed (a) that it was absolutely necessary to have recourse to the Original *Greek*, to correct the great number of faults that were in that Version, because there were so many different *Latin* Copies as there were different Books, and that every one did presume to change this ancient *Latin* Edition according to the *Greek* taken in his own sense; besides the Errors of the Transcribers which were also very numerous. That labour was by so much the more difficult, as the *Greek* Copies were not more correct than the *Latin*; and so it seems that the Rule to be followed was very uncertain: for the undertaking was to amend the Faults of the *Latin* by the *Greek*, which likewise had Faults. St. *Jerom* observes, in speaking of the Copies of that Time, (b) that the *Amanuenses* had altered them in a strange manner, by the mixture they had made of several Gospels together, taking from one that which seemed to be wanting in another. If it also happened that one Gospel had expressed a thing in a different manner from another, the Transcribers reformed the rest according to what they had first read: so that there was nothing but confusion in those ancient Copies. We see many things in St. *Mark* which belonged to St. *Luke* and St. *Matthew*; and in St. *Matthew*, which was St. *John*'s and St. *Mark*'s; and in short, every Gospel had something borrowed from the rest. It is true, that this Observation seems to reach the *Latin* Copies only; but in the sequel of this Discourse I shall make it appear, that it does likewise agree to several *Greek* Copies of that Time. If we had still, at this day, any of those ancient Books of which St. *Jerom* speaks, it would be easily believed, that he exaggerates the Faults thereof, the better to shew the necessity that was incumbent on him, to amend the *Latin* Version that was agreeable to some *Greek* Copies, which were no less defective than the *Latin*. Beza's *Greek* and *Latin* Copy which is now kept at Cambridge is of this number, having been writ out by *Latin Amanuenses* by such like Copies as were extant before St. *Jerom* reformed them. That

(a) Si enim Latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda, respondeant quibus: tot enim sunt exemplaria penè quot codices. Sin autem veritas est querenda de pluribus, cur non ad Græcam originem revertentes, ea quæ vel à vitiosis interpretibus malè reddita, vel à præsumptoribus imperitis emendata perversius, vel à librariis dormitantibus aut addita sunt, aut mutata, corrigimus. Hieron. Præf. in IV. Evang. ad Dam.

(b) Magnus siquidem hic in nostris codicibus error inolevit, dum quod in eadem re alius Evangelista plus dixit, in alio, quia minus putaverint, addiderunt, vel dum eundem sensum alius aliter expressit, ille qui unum è quatuor primum legerat, ad ejus exemplum ceteros quoque existimaverit emendandos. Unde accidit, ut apud nos mixta sint omnia, & in Marco plura Lucæ atque Matthæi, rursus in Matthæo plura Joannis & Marci & in cæteris reliquorum quæ aliis propria inveniantur. Hier. ibid.

R.

Calvinist

Calvinist never knew the nature of that Book (c) which was found in the Monastery of *Lyons*: he believed, that it had been corrected in some places by an ignorant Scholiast, who had added some Notes or Amendments to it. But those Corrections or Notes were not made by a *Greek Caloiz*, seeing Books of that sort that were written in *Greek* with the ancient *Latin* Version, were never in use amongst the *Greeks* but the *Latins* only, as shall be made manifest in the following part of this Discourse. He is in a notorious mistake when he assures us, (d) that that Manuscript was brought from *Greece*, because he observed Remarks to be written in *Greek* therein. He knew not that the *Latins* who had some skill in the *Greek* Tongue, joined the *Greek* to the *Latin* Version in their Copies of the New Testament, and also of the Psalms.

They were not so zealous at that time for the *Latin* Tongue, but that they believed that the Original *Greek* was sometimes necessary, not only to regulate, but also to understand it. Upon this ground St. *Jerom* and St. *Augustin* judged, that it was fit to correct the *Latin* in many places by the *Greek*, when the former happens to be defective. That the Original might be the more easily consulted, those who were curious did joyn it in the same Copy to the ancient *Latin* Edition. Neither did *Beza* observe, that the *Greek* and the *Latin* of Manuscripts of that sort are written with the same hand, and that the *Greek* has a greater resemblance of the ancient Capital Letters of the *Latins* than of those of the *Greeks*. The former are more square, the great Letters of the *Greeks* are longer and finer. This I observed in reading the second part of that *Cambridge* Copy which is in the King's Library, and another the like Copy which is in the Library of the Religious *Benedictines* of St. *Germain*. These two Copies, which contain the Epistles of St. *Paul*, do so little differ from one another, as well in the *Greek* as in the *Latin*, that it would seem the one had been copied from the other, but that the Characters of that of the *Benedictines* are greater and more majestical, and that it is less disfigured by Corrections. It may be easily known by the fashion of the Characters of those two Copies, and by the ancient *Latin* Version which is joined to the *Greek*

(c) *Quatuor Evangeliorum & Actorum Apostolicorum Græco-Latinum exemplar ex S. Irenæi Cenobio Lugdunensi ante aliquos annos nactus, mutilum quidem illud, & neque satis emendatè ab initio ubique descriptum, neque ita, ut oportuit, habitum, sicut ex paginis quibusdam diverso charactere insertis, & indocti cujuspiam Græci Calogeri barbaris adscriptis alicubi notis apparet. Bez. Epist. ad Acad. Cantab.*

(d) *Est hoc exemplar venerandæ vetustatis, ex Græciâ, ut apparet ex barbaris quibusdam notis ad marginem adscriptis, adportatum. Bez. ibid.*

Text, that they were copied by the *Latins* for the use of that Church. The *Greek* and the *Latin* are written with the same Hand, and with a Letter altogether alike; so that there are Letters that are purely *Greek* in the *Latin*.

Moreover, there is one thing that is very singular in those two Manuscripts, and that can only agree to the *Latins*. It is certain, that the *Greeks* did reckon amongst the number of the Epistles of *S. Paul*, that which is directed to the *Hebrews*; whereas many *Latin* Churches did not receive it. And this Epistle is not put with the others in those two Copies. It is placed separately at the end of the Book. Which cannot be accounted a Transposition, or any other thing of the like nature, chargeable on those who joyned the Leaves of those two Copies together. For the end and the beginning of every one of the Apostle *Paul's* Epistles are there very exactly marked, and in the same order as we read them at this day. Yet there is no mention made of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, because the Churches of those who made use of the Copies did not believe that it belonged to *S. Paul*, nor that it was so much as Canonical. And for this reason they added, immediately after the Epistle to *Philemon*, a Catalogue of all the Books which were read in those Churches; and this Epistle is not marked with others in the Catalogue. It is only found at the end of those Books as foreign to the Work, and as a Piece that does not carry the same Authority with the others.

All this does evidently prove, that those two Manuscript Copies of *S. Paul's* Epistles, which are of the same nature with that of *Cambridge*, which contains the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, were not written by the *Greeks*, seeing all the Churches of the *Greeks*, that of the *Arians* only excepted, did always acknowledg the Epistle to the *Hebrews* for Divine and Canonical, and which they never separated from the rest of that Apostle's Epistles. Nor can we believe, that the *Greeks* would joyn to their *Greek* Copies a *Latin* Version which they did not understand, and which was altogether unprofitable to them. In short, the numerous Faults that are in the *Greek* of those Copies is a new proof that they were written by *Latin Amanuenses*, who had no knowledge of the *Greek* Language. I speak not of the small Orthographical Faults, which are observed in the ancient Books that were copied by the *Greeks*, as well as in those that were copied by the *Latins*; but of certain Faults in the Words which can only be applied to the latter, and of which I would produce several Examples, if I did not believe that it has been evidently proved, that the Manuscripts of that nature, which were used in the Western Churches, before *S. Jerom* amended his ancient *Latin* Version, were written by *Latin* Transcribers.

If *Beza* had made all these Observations, and if he had compared with those Manuscripts that which *S. Jerom* hinted in his Letter to Pope *Damasus*, he would have perceived the reasons of that great difference that is betwixt those Copies and others, from which were taken such as have been Printed in these latter times. That Father observed, that the former were altered by the mixture of several Gospels together, and that one Gospel had been corrected by another: We need only apply this Observation to the *Cambridge Copy*, which contains the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, and the same Faults will be acknowledged to be therein. We shall find in *S. Matthew*, for example, some Additions which are taken out of other Gospels, and the Genealogy in *S. Luke* amended by that which is in *S. Matthew*. The Critical Reflections that he made in that Letter on the Copies of his Time, has so great a relation to the *Cambridge Copy*, that they would seem to have been made for no other purpose, but to give us an exact knowledge of that Copy (e) which differs so much from others, that *Beza* does testifie, that he durst not furnish us with all the variations thereof, lest he should give offence to some sort of Men.

* Codicum
Græcorum
emendatâ
collatione
sed veterum.

But *S. Jerom*, who informs us that the Copies of the ancient *Latin* Version that was agreeable to the *Greek* Copies of this kind were very defective, he does also acquaint us with other *Greek* Copies that were more exact, by which he had amended it. And by that he does entirely remove that pretended scandal. This Learned Critick, to effect his Amendments, had recourse * to the ancient and the most exact *Greek* Copies, by the means of which he removed that Confusion which was in the *Latin* Edition of that time, and in some *Greek* Copies which were in nothing different from that Edition. (f) He made use of the *Greek* Copy of the Gospels to which *Eusebius* had added certain Canons, which we find at this day at the beginning of the Manuscript Copies, (as well *Greek* as *Latin*) and also before some Editions. We know by the means of these Canons, what the Evangelists have that is common or alike, and what they have peculiar to each of them. By this Method he applied a remedy in some sort, for removing the Disorder that was in the vulgar Copies.

(e) Vos admonendos duxi tantum à me, in *Luce* præsertim Evangelio, repertam esse dissonantiam, ut vitandæ quorundam offensioni asservandam potius quam publicandam existimem. Bez. ibid.

(f) Canones quoque quos *Eusebius* *Cæsariensis* Episcopus *Alexandrinum* secutus *Ammonium* in decem numeros ordinavit, sicut in *Græco* habentur expressimus. Hieron. præf. in IV. Evang. ad Dam.

He does nevertheless add, that to the end he might not leave the ancient *Latin* Copy too much, which was then in use, (g) he had observed this moderation, to amend nothing but what changed the sense, retaining, as to the rest, that ancient Version. This Reformation is judicious, and it does withal discover to us, the reasons of the great difference that is betwixt the *Cambridge* Copy and those at this day. By this we further know, why those ancient *Greek* Manuscripts (which were extant before S. *Jerom* amended the vulgar) do better agree with our vulgar, than the Printed *Greek*, which was taken from the Copies that were used in the *Greek* Churches. Seeing he himself testifies, that he did not altogether follow the *Greek* Copies by which he amended the ancient *Latin* Version, a part of which he kept, he has left many places in his Edition which were agreeable to the *Greek*, by which it was made, or at least revised. But it is the same *Greek* that is in the *Cambridge* Copy, in that of *Clermont* which is in the Royal Library, and in the Copy of the Religious *Benedictins* of the Abbey of S. *Germain*.

Erasmus and some other Criticks after him, who knew not the difference that was betwixt those two sorts of *Greek* Copies, believed that those which were more agreeable than the rest to the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, were amended by our vulgar. And thus he makes answer to *Stunica*, who had found these words in our vulgar, *Super tristitiam* (Epistle II. to the *Corinthians*, chap. 2. vers. 3.) in an ancient *Greek* Copy which had been brought from *Rhodes*, (b) To this Copy of *Rhodes* (saith *Erasmus*) I oppose the many ancient Manuscripts that I saw in England, in Brabant, and at *Basse*—And I found some *Greek* Copies which were corrected by our *Latin*, and I conjecture that that of *Rhodes* is of this number—I would give more credit to a *Greek* Copy which does not altogether agree with our *Latin* Edition.

It is possible that some *Latins* had corrected in several places those *Greek* Copies which *Erasmus* does assure us he had seen. I have also read the like Amendments in the most ancient Manuscripts that are in our Hands; but they were all done by other *Greek* Copies, and not by the *Latin* Edition only. I need no other Example, to shew the

(g) *Quæ ne multum à lectionis Latinæ consuetudine discreparent, ita calamo temperavimus, ut his tantum quæ sensum videbantur mutare correctis, reliqua manere pateremur ut fuerant. Hier. ibid.*

(h) *Ego illi Rhodiensi oppono tot vetusta exemplaria quæ nos vidimus partim in Angliâ, partim in Brantiâ, partim Basileâ—ac deprehendi quosdam Græcos codices ad nostros esse castigatos. Quo de numero suspicor esse Rhodiensem illum—Ego magis fiderem Græco exemplari quod non usquequaque consentiret cum nostris. Erasmus, Resp. ad Stun.*

Falshood of *Erasmus* his Conjecture, but that which did afford him an occasion to make this Critical Observation, and to believe, that the Manuscript of *Rhodes* was corrected by the *Latin*. For we read these Words, *ἐν αὐτῇ*, Epist. II. to the *Corinthians*, chap. 2. vers. 3. not only in the Copy of *Rhodes*, which was followed in that place by the Cardinal *Ximenes* in his *Alcala* Edition, but also in the ancient Copy of *Clermont*, which is the second part of that of *Cambridge*, and in that of the *Benedictins* of the Abbey of *S. German*. Those two Manuscripts, as it has been already observed, are of the number of those ancient *Greek* Copies, to which the ancient *Latin* Version is agreeable, and whereof *S. Jerom* does witness, that he preserved one part in his New Edition, that he might not too much neglect the ancient *Vulgar*, which was in the Hands of every one.

I found indeed these Words, *Super tristitiam*, in that ancient *Vulgar*, which is joyned to the *Greek* Text, in the Copy of the Royal Library, and in that of the Abbey of *S. Germain*. *S. Jerom* has kept them in his new Edition, according to the Method which he proposed to follow, designing to amend that only which did change the sense. If *Erasmus* had contented himself to say, that they had been taken from another place of *S. Paul*, *Ex alio loco Pauli adjecta*, he would have had more reason; being certain that there are the like Additions in the ancient Copies, and also sometimes in their synonymous terms. For there we find in some places two Readings which the Transcribers have joined together, that nothing might be forgotten by them. If there had been cause to believe that the *Greek* had been amended by the *Latin*, that could be only true of the ancient *Greek* Copies which were in use amongst the *Latins* before *S. Jerom*'s time, and not of those of the latter Ages. But it is more probable that the *Latin* was amended by the *Greek*. I here speak of the ancient *Latin* which was taken from the *Greek* Copies that were altered in so many places, that that Father was obliged to revise the *Latin* by other *Greek* Copies that were more correct.

Yet I can hardly believe, that the ancient *Vulgar* had all those Faults at the beginning, the *Greek* Copies possibly not being as yet so corrupted, as they were afterwards. Seeing this Principle was generally received amongst the *Latins*, that the Version was to be corrected by the Original, it happened apparently, that the *Greek* being altered by Glosses and by Additions, they assumed the liberty to insert the same Glosses and Additions in the *Latin* Copies; and they were so numerous, that *S. Jerom* durst only take a part of them, because he would have been otherwise obliged to make too great a Change. He also prevented what might have been objected about the

the thing. (i) There is no body (saith he) who sees that the ancient Vulgar does so much differ from my new Edition, but will presently cry out that I am false and impious, who durst presume to change and reform the ancient Edition of the Church in so many places.

According to the Principle that we have established, *Stunica*, who by the order of Cardinal *Ximenes*, had compared many ancient *Greek* Copies with the *Latin* Edition, could say (k) that the *Latin* Copies are very agreeable to the *Greek*, if we pass the *Greek* Copies at this day, and only consider the Copies that *S. Jerom* used for making his new Edition, and which he assures us to have been ancient. Nevertheless it cannot be inferred from thence, that the Reading of those ancient Copies is always to be preferred to these which are at present called new. For the latter may be agreeable to those of *S. Jerom*, seeing he assures us, that he did not resolve to follow those Copies exactly, that he might not be thought to introduce too many Innovations into the *Latin* Bible. *Stunica* likewise adds (l) that if there be any difference betwixt the *Latin* and that ancient *Greek*, it does consist only in some words, and not at all in the sense, because that Father did not intend to make any change in those places where the sense was the same.

It is not then true, as some others have alledged, that our *Latin* Edition does represent the first Edition of the Apostles, in all those places where it agrees with those ancient *Greek* Copies formerly mentioned. For besides that they had great Imperfections, as I have proved, *S. Jerom*, who consulted the most correct Copies for making his new Edition, has left on purpose some of those Imperfections

(i) *Quis enim doctus pariter vel indoctus, cum in manus volumen assumpserit, & à salvâ quam semel imbibit viderit discrepare quod lectitat, non statim erumpat in vocem, me falsarium, me clamitans esse sacrilegum, qui audeam aliquid in veteribus libris addere, mutare, corrigere?* Hieron. præf. in IV. Evang. ad Dam.

(k) *Annotavimus Latina cum Græcis optimè convenire. Græca autem dico, non qualiacunque exemplaria significare volo, sed ea tantum quæ apud Græcos antiquissima reputantur, qualia videlicet illa fuerunt ad quorum collationem D. Hieronymus nostra olim emendavit; non enim quæ passim ferebantur exemplaria in recognitione illâ Hieronymum secutum, sed vetera ipsemet asserit.* Stun. in antapol. adv. Fab. Stap.

(l) *Quod si alicubi præter librariorum mendas Latini codices à Græcâ origine variare videntur, in verbis id tantum erit, non in sensu. Ubi enim idem sensus erat, noluit D. Hieronymus quicquam immutare.* Stun. ib.

therein.

therein. I do not examine if that Learned Critick revised the Epistles of *S. Paul*, and the rest of the New Testament as well as the Gospels. This belongs to the Second Book of this Work, where we shall treat of the Versions. 'Tis sufficient to suppose here, as certain *de facto*, that the *Latin* Version of *S. Paul's* Epistles was amended as well as the Gospels, whether that Correction was performed by *S. Jerom* or another, and that it was revised in such a manner, that that ancient Edition is preserved as far as it was possible. *Beza* who was ignorant of the original of that great number of various Readings in his own ancient Copy, which by it self contains more of those various Readings, than all other *Greek* Copies put together, does avow, (*m*) that he had observed nothing in all those Variations that might raise a suspicion, that it was corrupted by the ancient Hereticks. On the contrary, (saith he) I have found many things worthy of Observation, and tho in some places it was in some sort different from the ordinary Reading, that yet in these places it agreed with the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers. He does also assure us, that he observed some Readings therein that confirm the ancient *Latin* Edition. Indeed those Diversities are owing principally to the *Greeks*, who to render the Writings of the Gospels, and of the Apostles more intelligible, have illustrated one Gospel by another, and they have likewise explained by more clear Terms that which appeared to them obscure and intricate.

This custom of making the Apostles speak better *Greek* than they did in their Writings is very ancient. *Eusebius* gives us a considerable Example thereof in his Ecclesiastical History, where he observed, after some other Writers, that *Tatian* the Disciple of *Iustin Martyr* did not only compose a Body of Gospels of the four which he put in one, but (*n*) that he had also taken the liberty to correct *S. Paul's* Diction, to give him more proper and clearer Expressions. There were some *Greek* Churches which made no scruple to read those *Greek* Copies that had been revised in that manner, and which possibly did acknowledge no other. There is nothing more surprising than that which

(m) In hac tamen non sententiarum, sed vocum diversitate nihil profectò comperi, unde suspicari potuerim à veteribus illis hæreticis fuisse depravatam. Imò multa mihi videor deprehendisse observatione digna, quædam etiam sic à receptâ Scripturâ discrepantia, ut tamen cum veterum quorundam & Græcorum & Latinorum Patrum scriptis consentiant. Non pauca denique quibus vetusta Latina editio corroboratur. Bez. Epist. ad Acad. Cantab.

(n) Τὸ δὲ ἀποβλέπειν πρὸς τοιαῦτα πρὸς τὰ παλαιὰ μεταφράσαι φωνὰς, ὡς ἐκείνοις δὲ μόνον αὐτῶν ἢ τῆς φωνῆς οὐκ ἔστιν. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. cap. 29:

Theodoret (ο) writes of some Churches of his Dioceſs, which read publicly the Collection of the Gospels which Tatian had abridged of his own Head. Seeing they were ignorant of the mischief the Author had done, they used his Work because it was compendious. That Learned Bishop does assure us, that he found more than two hundred Copies of this Gospel of Tatian, which were very much esteemed in those Churches, from whom he took them, and restored he four Gospels to them.

We do not observe the like in the Cambridge Copy, which has been altered by some Orthodox Remarks, according to the custom of those first Ages, where they have taken the liberty to insert, by way of supplement, that which they believed to be wanting in one Gospel, taking it from another Gospel. Thus for example, after the word πολλῶν, chap. 20. of S. Matthew, vers. 28. they have added these Words, Τίμεις ὃ ζῆτέτε ἐκ μακροῦ αὐξήσαι, καὶ ἐκ μικροῦ ἐλαττοῦναι, εἰσερχόμενοι ὃ καὶ παρεκκληθέντες δεκνῆσαι, μὴ ἀνακλινέσθαι εἰ τοῦ ἑξήρῃσαι τόπος, μήποτε ἐνδεξόμενος σε ἐπείθῃ καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ δεκτικώτερος ἢ σὺ σοι, ἐπὶ κατωτέρῳ, καὶ κατωχονδύτῃ. Ἐὰν δὲ ἀναπίσης εἰς τὸν ἥλιον τόπον, καὶ ἐπείθῃ σὺ ἥλιον, ἔσθαι σοι ὁ δεκτικώτερος, σύναγε ἐπὶ αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔσται σοι τὸτο χερίσμων. It is found in the same sense in the ancient Latin Version which is joyned to that Greek Copy: *Vos autem queritis de minimo crescere, & de magno minui. Introeuntes autem & rogati cenare, ne discubueritis in eminentioribus locis, ne forte dignior te superveniat, & accedens cene invitator dicat tibi, Adhuc, deorsum accede, & confundaris. Si autem discubueris in minimum locum, & superveniat minor te, dicet tibi invitator cene, Collige adhuc superius, & erit tibi hoc utile.* That is, But you seek to rise from a low condition, and from being great to become servants. When thou art bidden of any man to supper, sit not down in the highest room, lest a more honourable man than thou be bidden of him, and he that bade thee and him come and say unto thee, Give this man place, and thou begin with shame to take the lowest room: But if thou dost sit down in the lowest room, and another poorer man than thou do come, he will say unto thee, Friend, go up higher, and this shall be profitable for thee.

(ο) Ἐχρήσαντο ὃ Τάτω ὁ μόνος οἱ τὸ Ταπανὲ συμμορίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ τοῖς ἀποστολικοῖς ἐπομῶν δόγμασι τὸ σωματικῆς κακουργίας ἢ ἐγνωκότες, ἀλλ' ἀπλήρως ὡς συντόμῳ τοῦ βιβλίου χρησάμενοι. Ἐπεὶ ὃ καὶ πλείους διακονίας βίβλους τοιαύτας ἐκ τῆ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίας τιτυμμέναι, καὶ πάσας συναγαγόντες ἀπεθάλω, καὶ τὰ τῶν τετάρων εὐαγγελιστῶν ἀντεστήσαντων εὐαγγέλια. Theod. Haret. Fabul. lib. i. tit. de Tat. n. 20.

Several Learned Criticks have observed this Addition after *Beza*: I have mark'd it with the same faults, as it is in the *Greek Manuscript*, where it is written in Capital Letters, without accents and without any distinction of words. *St. Jerome* took this Addition from the Ancient Latin Edition, when he revised it, by the Order of Pope *Damasus*. He was easily satisfied, according to the Method which he had proposed in his correction, that those words were taken from *St. Luke's Gospel*, Chap. 14. v. 8. & 9. but that there is some difference in the words: Which is an ordinary thing to that Copy, where the words are sometimes changed to others that are Synonymous. That Father who consulted the Ancient *Greek Copies*, especially those where the Canons of *Eusebius* were mark'd, presently perceived in reading the Tenth Canon, that that was only found in that 178 Section of *St. Luke*, and that so he must take it away from the 204 Section of *St. Matthew*, where it had been inserted in the Ancient *Greek*. And therefore, he adds the same Canons of *Eusebius* to the Latin Edition, which he had amended by good *Greek Copies*, that he might remove that mixture and confusion that was in the Latin Copies. By this way there is a distinction observed betwixt what was common to the several Gospels, and what was peculiar to every one of them. *Cum itaque* (saith *St. Jerome*) *canones legeris qui subjecti sunt, confusionis errore sublato, & similia omnia scies, & singulis sua quæque restitues.*

*Hierons
pref. in
W. Evan.
ad Dam.*

There are several other the like Editions in that *Cambridge Copy*, which it is needless to mention, because they may be seen in *Beza's* Notes upon the New Testament, in the Sixteenth Volume of the Polyglott Bible of *England*, and in the *Greek Edition* of the New Testament Printed at *Oxford*. We will only observe, that *Beza*, and likewise some other Criticks, who knew not the original cause of those changes, delivered nothing concerning them but what was only Founded on wide conjectures; whereas if they had compared that Ancient Copy with *St. Jerome's* Observations, in his Letter to Pope *Damasus*, they would have acknowledged, that a Part of the *Greek* and *Latin Copies*, were at that time agreeable to that of *Cambridge*. That Learned Father amended them by the best *Greek Copies*: If we had any other *Greek Copies* of that time, besides that of *Cambridge*, that contained the Gospels and the *Acts* of the Apostles, we should find the same Additions in them. The Copy of the Benedictines of the Abbey of *St. Germain*, which has *St. Paul's* Epistles, does perfectly agree, (as well in the *Greek* as in the *Latin*) with that of the Royal Library, which is the Second Part of that of *Cambridge*.

It is only (for example) in the latter Copy, that we read Chap. 6. of

6. of St. *John*, v. 56. these Words added, Καθώς ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ. Ἀλλὰ ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ μὴ λάβετε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὡς τὸ ἄρτον τὸ ζῶντος καὶ ἐσθίετε τὸν ζῶντα ἐν ὑμῖν. *As my Father is in me, I am also in my Father: Verily, verily, I say unto you, if ye receive not the body of the Son of Man as the Bread of life, you have no life in you.* Beza is surpris'd with this Addition, in uno codice vetusto (saith he) mirum hic quiddam deprehendimus: It seems that he meant another Copy than that of Cambridge, and he likewise does place this Addition, immediatly after the 53 verse, whereas in that of Cambridge it is in the 68. after the word αὐτῷ, that is to say, after the 56 verse; where it is also read in one of Robert Stephen's Copies, whence that Calvinist might have taken it, without speaking of his Ancient Cambridge Copy. If he had consult'd it, he would not have said in his Note upon that place, that (p) he durst not wholly reject that Addition, especially the first Part, which is found in another place; but that he durst not also admit it, because he read it only in one Copy. He does add afterwards, agreeably to his own prejudices rather than to the truth, I suspect that the other Part is supposititious, because I find nothing like it elsewhere: For he makes no mention in any other place, of taking the Body without the Blood; and the Copy whence that reading was taken, was compar'd in Italy, where it was easie to add something in hatred of the Bohemians, that is to say, of the Gospel.

That Man was so extremely zealous for his Calvinism, that he took no notice, that the same Addition is in the Cambridge Copy, which he often calls *vetustissimum, & admirandæ Vetustatis codicem*. The Bohemians had not come on the Stage in those Ancient times: Stephen's Greek Copy which was compar'd with many others in Italy, is very sincere in that place. That Addition was in all probability taken from a Copy like to that of Cambridge; and there was no talk then of taking away the Cup, nor of those who are called Evangelical or Protestants: But as it has been already observ'd, there were always several Glosses added to those ancient Manuscripts, which were for the most part taken from some other places of those same Books; besides some Illustrations that were insert'd therein.

(p) Hac ego sicut temerè non expunxerim, ac præsertim priorem partem, quæ totidem verbis alibi reperitur, ita non faciliè admiserim, cum in uno illo exemplari sint à nobis reperta. Certè alteram partem suppositam esse suspicor, quia simile nihil alibi invenio: neque enim usquam sit mentio sumendi corporis præterito sanguine; Exemplar illud unde hæc desumpsimus fuerat in Italiâ collatum, ubi facile fuit aliquid in Bohemorum, id est Evangelii odium, addere. Bez. Annot. in c. 6. Joann. v. 53.

This is not the place for bringing other Proofs of *Beza's* disingenuity in his Notes upon the New Testament; it will be more proper to do that elsewhere. I designed only in this place, to make use of some Examples, in which I might give some account of that Ancient *Cambridge* Manuscript, which to this day has been admired for the manifold diversity of its Readings, whilst true reasons thereof have not been observed.

F. Morin, to whom was given the Collection that *Junius* the Library-Keeper of *Cambridge*, had made of all the places where that Ancient *Greek* Copy differed from others; did content himself with publishing those which agreed with our vulgar. Nevertheless he could not but admire, (q) that enormous difference, which appeared chiefly in the Gospel of *St. Luke*, where he is very far from, not only the ordinary *Greek*, but from the vulgar. Those varieties, (saith that Father,) consist in entire Periods, which were retrenched or added, strained or explained in other terms. He is confident, that the Version of the Septuagint does not so much differ from the *Hebrew* Masoretick Text, (the transpositions excepted, which alter not the Text) as the *Cambridge* Copy does differ from all others: But because it does agree with them in every thing that relates to the scope of the Text, he thinks that it was taken from another Copy of *St. Luke*, into which those variations in process of time had slipped: Yet he dares not be positive, because he knows not the reasons of that great diversity. And therefore he adds (r) that possibly they might have inserted in some Copies of *St. Luke*, that which was found in other supposed Gospels, and that the Fathers had afterwards been at the pains to retrench those Additions. If that Critick had narrowly weighed *St. Jerome's* Preface, dedicated to Pope *Damasus*, he would there have found all his doubts cleared.

Seeing the *Cambridge* Copy observes the same Order, with all

(q) *Evangelium Lucae* in isto antiquissimo manuscripto à vulgato *Græco* textu, atque etiam à *Vulgatâ Latinâ* Versione adeò distat, tam multe periodi vel truncatæ sunt, vel superadditæ, vel mutilatæ, vel aliis verbis enunciatae, ut legenti non sine causâ sint admirationi. Si transpositiones excipias, quæ sensum non ledunt, nulli Septuaginta Interpretes à Masoretico textu tam sæpè & enormiter variant, quàm hic *Lucæ* codex à trito & vulgato textu sive *Græco* sive *Latino*. Sequitur tamen xxi modis textus *Lucæ* ordinem & historiam: ita ut appareat ex alio *Lucæ* manuscripto, hæc olim exscripta fuisse, hancque varietatem lapsu temporis irrepsisse. *Jo. Mor. Exerc. Bibl. lib. 1. Exerc. 2. c. 3.*

(r) Fieri potuit ut antiquitus in quædam exemplaria *Lucæ* nonnulla ex iis Evangeliiis quæ vobis deditur existimata sunt, irrepsissent, quæ postea Sanctorum Patrum diligentia resecta fuerint. *Mor. ibid.*

the

the other *Greek* Copies of the New Testament, as to the thread of the History, it does manifestly prove, that it has not been on purpose altered by the Hereticks. Moreover, seeing the alterations that are therein, do not introduce any Paradox Opinion, but consist for the most part, in some words which have been placed instead of others, and in some Additions that have been taken from other Evangelists, or in bare Illustrations, we may infer from thence, that all the change proceeded from the liberty that was taken by some at that time, for rendring the Books of the New Testament the more intelligible, without putting themselves to the trouble of adhering to the words of the Original, so long as nothing of the sense was altered. The Criticks, especially St. *Jerome*, in reforming the ancient Vulgar, did at the same time amend those ancient *Greek* Copies, with which he agreed entirely. He used for that purpose, other *Greek* Copies, which were more exact, and especially those to which he had added the Ten Canons of *Eusebii*. These latter Copies which were amongst the *Greeks*, before St. *Jerome*'s time always remained with them, which is easily proved by the same Canons of *Eusebii*.

One of the most surprizing varieties of that Copy, is that which is found in the Genealogy of Jesus Christ, Chap. 3. of St. *Luke*, for this Genealogy is the same with that in St. *Matthew*, unless it be, that it goes up to *Solomon* in this manner. Ὁν ὡς ἐποιζεν, ὁ Ἰωσήφ τῷ Ἰακώβ, τῷ Ματθαῖ, τῷ Ἐλισαζαῖ, τῷ Ἐλιδῷ, τῷ Ἰακείν, τῷ Σαδούκ, τῷ Ἀζά, τῷ Ἐλιαχέμ, τῷ Ἀβιδῷ, τῷ Ζοροβάβελ, τῷ Σαλαθιηλ, τῷ Ἰεχονί, τῷ Ἰωακίμ, τῷ Ἰωσία, τῷ Ἀμώ, τῷ Μαρασῷ, τῷ Ἐζεκία, τῷ Ἀχάζ, τῷ Ἰωάν, τῷ Ὀζεία, τῷ Ἀυασί, τῷ Ἰωά, τῷ Ὀρχόν, τῷ Ἰωρζμ, τῷ Ἰουφάδ, τῷ Ἀσά, τῷ Ἀβιδῷ, τῷ Ροβοάμ, τῷ Σολομών, τῷ Δαυίδ. It is manifest that this Genealogy has been designedly amended by that of St. *Matthew*, yet with an Addition of those Persons which he had omitted. *Beza*, who has also made mention of this diversity, in his Notes upon this Chapter of St. *Luke*, declares (f) that he cannot imagine how that can be, because the *Syriack* Interpreter, and all the Ancient Ecclesiastical Writers are altoge-

(f) Quinam autem id sit factum nescio, cum recepta lectio tum Syri ipsius interpretis auctoritate, tum Scriptorum omnium Sacrorum, propterea de Matthaeo cum Lucâ conciliando laborantium, consensu pland confirmetur: cui sanè præjudicium ullum afferre nec velim nec ausim. Tantum dico fieri potuisse, ut ipsis Evangelistarum temporibus Judæi genealogiam istam quantum in ipsis fuit depravarint, quasi fidem cæteris de Christo narrationibus abrogaturi, quæ fraus à plerisque non animadverta facile obrinuerit. *Bezæ*. Annot. in c. 3. Luc. v. 23.

ther against that Copy, from whom he neither intends, nay nor dares to recede. That might, as he conjectures, have happened from the very time of the Evangelists, the *Jews* having corrupted that Genealogy that they might not believe the other Histories, which are recorded in the Gospels.

There is nothing more ridiculous than this conjecture of *Beza*, who does charge the *Jews* with a crime which they never thought of; besides that it was of no advantage to them, because they could not corrupt all the Copies which they kept by them. There are none to be blamed for that alteration of the Ancient Copies of the New Testament, but the Christians and even the Orthodox, as it has been frequently observed after St. *Jerome*, who, in his Letter to Pope *Damasus*, has taken notice of the change of which we now speak. He says, that in those days they took the liberty to amend the Gospels by that Gospel, which they had read first. *Ille qui unum è quatuor primum legerat, ad ejus exemplum ceteros quoque existimaverat emendandos.* It is evident, that the Genealogy in St. *Luke* was reformed in the *Cambridge* Copy, according to this Method, and that what was supposed to be wanting therein, was supplied from the Old Testament. And the accusation supposed to have been brought against the *Jews*, was so far from admitting a sufficient ground of reason, that there was nothing at that time so common, as Copies, as well Greek as Latin of that kind, especially in the Churches of the West, before St. *Jerome* had revised the Ancient Latin Edition: It would be easie to prove, that the Gospel of St. *Mark* has been likewise amended in some places, by that of St. *Matthew*; and further, that there have been some words changed for others that were synonymous, which appeared to be more intelligible; but that labour would be to no purpose, because every one may consult the divers Readings of that ancient Copy in the sixth Tome of the Polyglott Bible of *England*, and in the Greek Edition of the New Testament Printed at *Oxford*. It is enough that I have observed the true reason of those numerous variations, concerning which the Criticks have given us very wide, and even false conjectures.

Those who revised those ancient Copies, intending nothing but to make them clear, without being at the pains to confine themselves to the true Reading of the Evangelists and the Apostles, have given Paraphrases on them, whensoever they believed that they were not sufficiently understood. They have also abridged them in those places that they thought intricate, by reason of superfluous

perfluous words, which they have also transposed in innumerable places for the same reason: Which is enough to be observed once for all, in general, without a particular rehearsal of the Passages, which have been altered in the *Cambridge Copy*, as well in the Gospels, as in the *Acts* of the Apostles. This does appear yet more in the *Acts*, because there was a very great liberty taken of reforming that History in the first Ages of the Church. Nevertheless whatever change those Books have undergone in the ancient time, and that the very words of the Evangelists and the Apostles were not observed, yet it will not be found that the sense has suffered any alteration. They only endeavoured to make them the more intelligible to the People, and for that end, it was necessary to refine them, seeing they were full of *Hebraisms* and very concise Phrases, which they were obliged to illustrate according to that Method.

Nevertheless, in the *Cambridge Copy* there are certain Additions whereof the same thing cannot be said, because they are plain Matters of Fact that have been added. For example, Chapter 6. of St. Luke, verse 5. after the word *οὐκ ἔστιν*, we read in that Copy, *τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ διακριθεὶς ὅτι ἐξακολουθεῖν τῷ οὐκ ἔστιν, εἰ μὴ αὐτῷ; ἀνδρῶν, εἰ μὴ οἱ οὗτοι ἢ οἱ αὐτοὶ, κἀνδρῶν, εἰ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν, ἐκτρέφεται ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ.* That is to say, *On the same day, seeing a Man travel on the Sabbath day, he said unto him, my friend, if thou knowest what thou art doing, thou art happy, but if thou dost not know it, thou art cursed and a transgressor of the Law.* This History might possibly have been taken from some Ancient Apocryphal Book, where it was common in the first Ages of Christianity; and it may be, it was then believed, that it came from the Apostles or their Disciples. And therefore those who presumed to reform the first Copies of the New Testament, in so many places, upon the bare prospect of rendring them intelligible to all the World, would not scruple to add thereto Histories of that sort, which they believed to be true. We have formerly taken notice of examples of the like nature in the Gospel of the *Nazarens*: If we had at this day a sufficient number of Copies of this nature, that were before St. Jerome's time, especially in the Western Churches, we might discover some other Additions in them, which are not known to us at present, because we have little or nothing remaining of the Books of those first Ages.

Although.

Although it does not appear to us, that the Christians have had Massorets or Criticks like to those of the *Jews*, who have given to the Books of the New Testament that uniformity which is found to have been from many Ages in the *Greek* Copies, and also in the *Latin*, since *St. Jerom*: it is probable that the *Greeks* followed certain Copies which they judged to be more exact than others, and that they were Corrected by learned Criticks. These Copies were used afterwards as a Massore or Rule. By these *St. Jerom* Corrected the ancient *Latin* Edition, by the Order of Pope *Damasus*. Let us now examin the second Part of the ancient *Cambridge* Copy, which does contain the Epistles of *St. Paul*.

CHAP. XXXI.

Of the second part of the Cambridge Copy, which contains St. Paul's Epistles. Examples of the various Readings that are in that second Part. Critical Reflections upon the whole matter.

There is nothing can more contribute to the knowledge of the state of the *Greek* Copies of the New Testament, in the most ancient times of the Church, than those Books that were so common before *St. Jerom*, and which are not extant, but in very few places at this day. It will be in vain to look for them in the Churches of the East; because they having been written in *Greek* and in *Latin*, and with the same Hand, it is easie to judge that they could be only extant in the West. We are indebted to the Monks for having preserved some of those Copies for us. That of *Cambridge*, as has been said, was found in a Monastery of *Lyons*. The *Benedictine* Monks of the Abbey of *St. Germain*, have in their Library the second part of the like Copy, in which the Epistles of *St. Paul* are contained. *Peter Pitbou*, (a) had seen those two ancient Copies, which he esteemed for their great antiquity. He does testifie, that it was believed, that

(a) *Vidimus & nos aliquando vetustissimum exemplar Evangeliorum literis illis majoribus exaratum, adjectis è regione Græcis, quod olim fuisse dicebatur Ecclesiæ Lugdunensis. Vidimus & aliud Epistolarum exemplar ejusdem formæ & ætatis ex Corbejæ majoris Galliæ Monasterio, quæ tanquam sanctioris antiquitatis κενώματα non sine religione suspicimus & veneramur.* Petr. Pith. de SS. Bibl. Interpr.

the former was brought from the Church of *Lyons*, and the latter from the famous Abbey of *Corby* in *France*. *Christian Druthmar*, an ancient *Benedictine* Monk, who had been for some time in that Abbey, has pointed to us the first part of this latter Copy, when he makes mention of a *Greek* Copy, which he believed to have belonged to *St. Hilary*, where the Gospel of *St. John* did immediately follow that of *St. Matthew*. *Vidi* (saith that Monk) *Librum Evangelii Græcè scriptum, qui dicebatur Sancti Hilarii fuisse, in quo primi erant Matthæus & Joannes*. In the Royal Library, there is another *Greek* and *Latin* Copy of *St. Paul's* Epistles, which differs almost in nothing from that of the *Benedictines*, unless it be that the Letters are not so great, nor so majestick, although they be the same as to their figure and duration. The King's Copy is also more disfigured by reason of innumerable corrections, than that of the Abbey of *St. Germain*. For although this latter has likewise been amended in many places, the corrections thereof are not so gross.

*Christ.
Druthm.
Expos. in
Matth c. i.*

Further, we may call those two Copies the second part of that of *Cambridge*, because they contain that ancient *Greek*, and that ancient *Latin* Version, which was used in the Churches of the West, before *St. Jerom* had reformed it. It is true that that Father in his Letter to *Damasus*, does only make mention of four Gospels which he had revised, and we are not clearly informed by another Hand, that he had corrected the rest of the N. T. after the same manner. But however it be, the thing is, it is certain that the whole ancient *Latin* Version was amended, and that the same method was observed in that Reformation, which *St. Jerom* does testify to have been followed in his own practice, when in compliance to the Order of *Pope Damasus*, he reformed the ancient *Latin* Translation.

Beza, in his Notes upon *St. Paul*, does frequently cite that ancient Copy of the King's Library, under the name of **The Copy of Clermont*. He also believed that it was the second Part of that which belongs to *Cambridge*. In which he is not mistaken. For it is the *Greek* and the *Latin* of those ancient *Greek* and *Latin* Copies that were commonly read before *St. Jerom's* time. It is not necessary for all that, that both of them should have been written with the same Hand. It is sufficient that they are of the same Age. And so it may be said, that that of the *Benedictines*, as well as the King's, is the second Part of the *Cambridge* Copy, because both the one and the other do represent the ancient *Vulgar* to us, to which they have added the *Greek*, with which it did agree.

* *Codex
Claro-
montanus.*

F. Morin, who had borrowed that ancient Manuscript of the *Du Puis*, that he might extract the various Readings that confirmed our *Vulgar*, does in his Exercitations, insist at some length on the Bible.

T

(b) He

(b) He is persuaded that the Latin Version, that is joyned to the *Greek*, is the ancient Translation, which was read in the West before St. *Jerom* had reformed it by the Command of Pope *Damasus*, according to the ancient *Greek* Copies. He (c) does also judge by the figure and bulk of the *Greek* and Latin Characters, which are almost worn out in some places, by reason of their antiquity, and by the Latin Version which he compared with our *Vulgar*, and with the Citations of the ancient Fathers, that that Copy was written before St. *Jerom*. He further adds, to prove the antiquity of the same Manuscript, a Catalogue of the Books of the Scripture, which had been inserted at the end, in which the twelve small Prophets are noted with the four great Prophets, and the Gospel of St. *John* before that of St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*. Moreover, the Book of the Pastor, the Epistle of *Barnabas*, and some others, are there placed in the number of the Books of Scripture. It is hard (saith F. *Morin*;) that all this should be since St. *Jerom*. *Quæ omnia Sancti Hieronymi ævum vix subsequi possunt, multa minus ipsa codicis scriptio.*

It is true, that the *Greek* and Latin Copies of that kind are more ancient than St. *Jerom*, if we consider the ancient Latin Version which was used in the West, before it was Revised by that Father. But F. *Morin's* Reasons do not prove that they were written from that time. For it is possible that the Monks, who Copied the ancient Books, writ out those Copies by those that were more ancient: and I believe that this did happen on that occasion. As for the Character, it cannot be denied but that it is most ancient; but those who have skill to judg of them, do not allow them to be above a thousand years standing; at least it is certain, that there are Books of the same Character which do not exceed that time. Neither do I see what can be concluded from Letters that are almost defaced, for the antiquity of a Manuscript. This only does prove that the Ink is not good. The truth is, the Copy of the *Benedictines* which is of the same antiquity, and has likewise a greater Letter, is still so fair, that one would believe by looking upon some of its Pages, (if judgment were to be given by the Ink and Parchment) that it had been but

(b) *Existimo versionem vetustissimi illius codicis Græco textui adversam eam esse, quæ Ecclesiæ Latina ut plurimum ante Sanctum Hieronymum utebatur, quam sanctus ille vir, jubente Damaso Pontifice, ad fidem Græcorum exemplarium postmodum recensuit & emendavit.* Jo. Mor. Exercit. Bibl. Exerc. 2. c. 4.

(c) *Consideratis figurâ, magnitudine & splendore characteris tam Græci quam Latini, illius ob vetustatem per seipsum multis in locis dimidiatâ obliteratione, passimque subobscurâ delineatione, versionis insuper cum Vulgarâ textuque Patrum comparatione, S. Hieronymi ætatem istius codicis scripto videtur omnino præcedere.* Mor. ibid.

just now written. Those who have a desire to preserve those ancient Manuscripts, ought to put leaves of Paper betwixt the leaves of the Parchment upon which the Writing is, to the end that the Ink may not wear off. They might at last have added to the end of those Copies, a very ancient Catalogue of the Books of the Bible.

The strongest proof in my Opinion for evincing the great antiquity of that Copy, is, that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* is not reckoned with the rest, in the number of *St. Paul's* Epistles, as I have formerly observed, but by it self, and out of the Body of those Letters that were read in the Church. *F. Morin* did not sufficiently consider that Manuscript, when he says, (speaking of the Catalogue, which is put at the end) (d) that they placed it before the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, in some Pages where there was nothing written as it happened. For that was done on purpose, the Epistle to *Philemon* being the last of the Copies of that sort, which the *Latins* had writ out for their use. Seeing they did not believe, that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* had been written by that Apostle, nor that it was Canonical, they did not joyn it to the other Epistles. And therefore they inserted that Catalogue of the Books of Scripture immediately after the Epistle of *St. Paul* to *Philemon*.

If *Beza* had considered the corrections that had been made in that Copy which he named of *Clermont*, he would easily have acknowledged, that Books of that sort were never in use amongst the *Greeks*, and that so it was not brought out of *Greece*, as he alledged. There are so many faults therein, especially in the *Greek*, that it is manifestly seen, that it could not have been written but by a person who was altogether ignorant of that Language. A good part of those faults were amended, and these were not only faults of the Orthography, but sometimes of Words. They further reformed that ancient Version in many places, by other *Greek* Copies, which came nearer to these at this day. Which without doubt was done by some *Latins*, who corrected at the same time the ancient Vulgar, by *St. Jerom's* new Edition.

We will not then, with *Beza*, charge the Observations that are placed in the Margins of that sort of Copies, on the *Greek* Priests, but on those of the Western Church, who had some knowledg of the *Greek* Language. As those Books passed through several Hands, so they have received amendments, some of which are more ancient than others. But after all, we still see the ancient Readings, as well in the *Greek* as in the Latin, especially in the Copy of the Li-

(d) Catalogus ille insertus est codici ante Epistolam ad Hebraeos in paginis quibusdam fortuito vacuis. Mor. ibid.

brary of *St. Germain*, which has been revised in so curious a manner, that the amendment does often consist in nothing else but in small strokes of the Pen in the Letters. Seeing those two Copies do differ in very few things, I shall in the following part of my Discourse, make use rather of the latter, than that of the King's Library, which is more disfigured.

F. *Morin* has observed in general, (e) that the *Clermont* Copy upon *St. Paul's* Epistles, does not so much vary from the ordinary Copies of the New Testament, as that of *Cambridge* does, and that it is also more agreeable to our Vulgar, though it is no less ancient than the other. The same thing is to be said of that of the *Benedictines* of the Abbey of *St. Germain*, because they are so much alike, that one would believe, that the one had been copied from the other. The reason of this great conformity of *St. Paul's* Epistles, in the *Clermont* Copy with the ordinary *Greek*, and the Latin of the Vulgar is evident, because he had no occasion to amend those Epistles by one another, as the Gospels; and they were not so much neglected in the first Ages of the Church, as the Acts of the Apostles, which had been revised with a great deal of liberty in many places. Yet if we carefully examin the places where those ancient Copies of *St. Paul's* Epistles, that were before *St. Jerom*, do differ from the Ordinary, we shall find that they were not reformed in the same manner, and according to the same method as the Gospels and the Acts. We shall there observe the like Additions of Words, Synonymous Terms, several Readings joyned together, with Glosses annexed. Moreover, Transpositions are frequently found there: which would seem to have been done on purpose, to render the Sense more clear, and also to avoid sometimes the Hyperbates with which *St. Paul's* Epistles are filled. There are also some places more abridged, than what are in the ordinary Copies. Whether it was that they intended to remove what was of no use, or that that is in truth the ancient Reading. For although those Copies have been revised, they were amended throughout; and then they might represent the ancient Reading. To the end that they may be the better known, I shall here give some examples taken from the Epistle to the *Romans*, and there may be a great many more observed in the second Book of this Work, with respect to the Vulgar.

(e) *Variarum istarum lectionum nulla adeo enormis est, atque ut ita dicam varia, ut cum iis quas ex priori volumine observavimus comparari possit. Paulinarum Epistolarum codex ille vulgato textui priore longe conformior est, licet illi antiquitate non cedat.* Mor. *ibid.*

In the Epistle to the *Romans*, Chap. 2. ver. 7. It is not in the Copy of the Abbey of St. Germain, ἀγαπῶντις Θεῷ, *Beloved of God*, neither is it expressed in the ancient Latin Version which is joyned to it. Indeed these Words make nothing for the Sense, which is sufficiently expressed by the others which follow, καλοῖς ἀγίοις, *called Saints*.

In the 13. v. of the same Chapter, instead of these Words, ἢ δέλω, *I will not*, we read ἢ οἶμαι (οἶμαι) *I think noi*. But they have placed in the Margin of the Clermont Copy ἢ δέλω, which is the ordinary Reading, and this happens frequently. In the 16. v. we do not read in that ancient Copy, τῷ Χριστῷ, *of Christ*, after the Word εὐαγγέλιον, *Gospel*, neither is it expressed in the two Vulgars. It is probable that τῷ Χριστῷ was added. Likewise, it is not found in some other ancient Greek Copies. In v. 29. there is not the Word πονεῖα, but immediately after ἀδικία, it is in that ancient Copy κακία, and it is read in the same manner in the ancient Vulgar, so that πονεῖα seems to be superfluous. The Vulgar at this day does also represent that ancient Reading, if the word *nequitia* be left out, which has been added for no use to the Greek at this day.

Verse 31. of the same Chapter, the word ἀπολύεις is not in that ancient Copy, but it has been added, neither is *sine fœdere*, in the ancient Vulgar, as it is in that which is used at this day, in conformity to the ordinary Greek. We shall observe that in the Copy of the Abbey of St. Germain, there are many the like Additions written of the same Hand with the body of the Book, and they are for the most part placed at the bottom of the Page with a mark of Reference, as if they had been true omissions. But these are ordinarily amendments according to some other Greek Copies. Additions of this sort are also common in the Latin. Nevertheless there are some places in which the Latin does not altogether answer to the Greek Addition. We see the same thing in the Copy that belongs to the Royal Library. They who copied those Manuscripts, by the ancient Copies, did at the same time correct them by others, and in process of time there were other amendments added thereto.

Verse 32. of the same Chapter, after the Word ἐπαγρόντες, we read in the same Copy ἢ ἐνόησαν, and in the ancient Vulgar, as well as in that we have at this day, it is *non intellexerunt*. Erasmus has observed, in his Remark upon this place, that he does not know why it is in the Latin Copies *non intellexerunt*, which is not in the Greek, unless it be, that it has been added in the Latin. F. Morin does as-
sure

sure us of the contrary, (f) that the Reading that is in our Vulgar was not St. *Jerom's*, but that it is in the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, who was before him, and who in this place followed the *Greek* of his time; or that that Father, having relied on *Greek* Manuscripts of the like nature, had inserted that sort of Additions: whence he does conclude, that that Change was afterwards made in the ordinary *Greek*, and not in our Vulgar. He does likewise make a general Rule of it.

It is true, that St. *Jerom*, or he who revised the ancient Vulgar, is not the Author of this Addition, *non intellexerunt*, seeing it is found in the *Greek* and *Latin* of St. *Germain* Copy, and in that of the Royal Library. But it cannot be concluded, with *F. Morin*, that we are obliged to prefer those ancient Copies to the ordinary *Greek* in all those places where there are the like Additions, it being certain that they were revised that they might be the more plain. It is convenient on such occasions to compare them with other Copies; and if it happen that not so much as one does agree with them, it is a sign that in those Places there have been Amendments made in those old Copies to which the ancient Vulgar was agreeable. St. *Jerom* does testifie, that in his new Edition, which is the Vulgar at this day, he left some of those Additions, because they did not change the sense.

(g) If we had (*F. Morin* continues) many of those Copies which were written above twelve hundred years ago, we would acknowledge that our Vulgar does perfectly agree with those ancient Copies, in those places where it does differ from the ordinary *Greek*. But suppose it were so, could it be alledged that our Vulgar does, in all those places represent the first Original of the Apostles, as *F. Amelote* did likewise think? I desire no other but St. *Jerom* to be Judge in this Dispute, which has so mightily divided Mens minds in this latter Age. That learned Critick does give us a very strange draught of those ancient Copies which have been written above these twelve hundred Years. He was obliged to reform the ancient *Latin* Edition, that was so defective, by other *Greek* Copies that were more correct; which he nevertheless performed in such a man-

Hieron.
Præf. in
IV. Evan.
ad Dam.

(f) Non de suo hæc addidit Hieronymus, sed qui cum præcesserat interpres hæc & similia verberat, & textui inseruerat, antiquorum codicum fidem sequens; vel ipse Hieronymus eadem fide fretus ista restituit. Mutatio postea facta est in Græco textu, non in Vulgatâ nostrâ, ut tot exemplis jam demonstravimus, atque iterum demonstrabimus. Mor. ibid.

(g) Si plura exemplaria, quale hoc est, ante mille ducentos & aliquot annos descripta aliquis nancisceretur, nihil in Vulgatâ nostrâ discrepans deprehenderetur, quod illis antiquis codicibus non confirmetur. Ibid.

ner

ner as to retain somewhat of the ancient Edition in those places where he might have corrected them by his *Greek Copies*. Can it be said that our *Vulgar* does represent the first and true Original of the Apostles in those places that have been left on purpose with their faults, because they had no mind to meddle with them? This is to shew that *F. Morin*, and after him *F. Amelote*, had not a sufficient knowledge of those *venerable and august Manuscripts* that were written *above twelve hundred years ago*. Antiquity is not a good proof of the Goodness and Faithfulness of a Record, when it is otherwise proved that that Record has been vitiated within that time.

Chap. 3. v. 12. of the same Epistle, we do not read in the Copy of the Abbey of *St. Germain*, *ὃς ἐστὶ ποιῶν ἄγαθον*, nor in the ancient *Latin Version* that is joined thereunto, *non est qui faciat bonum*. These words were only added, as well in the *Greek* as in the *Latin*, at the bottom of the Page, with a mark of Reference, as a Supplement which was taken from the ordinary *Greek Copies*, and from the *Vulgar* that had been revised. Altho those Words which are taken out of the *xiii. Psalm* (the *xiv.* in the *Hebrew*) are extant in all the *Greek Copies*, in conformity to the *Hebrew Text*, *St. Justin* does not read them in his Dialogue against the Jew *Tryphon*. It is possible, that those who revised the *Greek* of the New Testament in the ancient times left them out, as thinking them needless, seeing they were of the number of those Repetitions which are so frequent in the *Psalms*. We shall nevertheless observe, that *S. Justin* did instead of them read these other Words, *ὃς ἐστὶ ὁ ποιῶν*, which are in the same Epistle to the *Romans*, v. 7. But we cannot depend on the Citations of the Fathers, which are not very exact when they quote Scripture Passages. It would be dangerous to reform the *Greek Copies* of the New Testament by them, which might be easily justified by innumerable Examples.

Chap. 4. v. 9. after the Word *ἀποστολῆς*, the Word *μὲν* is read in that Copy, which yet is not expressed in the ancient *Vulgar* that is joined thereunto, although it is in that which is used at this day. The sense does require that Supplement. V. 16. of the same Chapter, the Word *μὲν*, that is in the ancient Copy as well as in the ordinary *Greek*, is not expressed in the ancient *Vulgar*, where we barely read, *non ei qui ex lege est*, and the Verb *ἐστὶ* is also in the *Greek*. Vers. 23. there is a Repetition made of *eis δικαιοσύνην* after the Word *αὐτοῦ*, and in the ancient *Vulgar* *ad iustitiam*, which is also retained in the *Vulgar* now used.

Chap. 5. vers. 1. instead of *ἐχούμεν*, there is in that ancient Copy *ἐχούμεν*, and in the two *Vulgars* *babeamus*. Vers. 2. we do not read in the same Copy *τῷ μέν*, nor in the ancient Version annexed to it,

it *per fidem*; but it is in our Vulgar agreeable to the ordinary Greek. Vers. 5. We read not in the Greek of that Copy ἡ δὲ ἀνὴρ, nor is it expressed in the ancient Vulgar; but it is marked at the bottom of the Page, as well in the Greek as in the Latin, which must have been taken from another Copy. Vers. 12. we do not read ὁ δὲ δαίμων after the Word ἀνθρώπος. Vers. 16. instead of ἀνθρώπου, we read ἀνθρώπων, and in the two Vulgars *peccatum*. Vers. 18. instead of δικαίωμα there is δικαίωμα, and in the two Vulgars *justitiam*.

Chap. 6. v. 11. we read not in the ancient Greek Copy τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, nor in the ancient Vulgar *Domino nostro*. Vers. 12. these Words τῷς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ, are not in the same Copy, nor in the Latin Version annexed to it, *in concupiscentiis ejus*. Vers. 16. we read not likewise in that Copy, εἰς θάνατον, nor in the ancient Vulgar *ad mortem*.

Chap. 7. v. 6. instead of ἐπιθυμίαις we read in the ancient Copy of St. Germain τῷ θανάτῳ, and in the two Vulgars *mortis*; which reading is conformable to Origen. Beza observes in his Remark upon that place, that he only found it in his ancient Clermont Copy. Nullius (saith he) Græci codicis auctoritate confirmatur hæc lectio, excepto illo Claromontano, quem alioqui plurimi facio. Vers. 14. instead of καὶ we read ἡ. These two Particles are often put for one another, as well in the Greek Copies as in the ancient Versions. Vers. 15. τῷ is not in the ancient Copy, nor hoc in the ancient Vulgar; where also we have not *bonum*, which is in the Vulgar at this day. Vers. 25. instead of εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ, there is in the ancient Version, ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, and in the two Vulgars *gratia Dei*.

Chap. 8. v. 38. This Verse is expressed in the ancient Copy after this manner, ἀγγέλῳ, ἔτι ἐξουσία, ἔτι ἀρχαὶ, ἔτι ἐκείνῳ, ἔτι μέλλοντα, ἔτι παλαιά, and in the ancient Vulgar, agreeable to that Reading, *neque Angelus, neque Potestas, neque initia, neque instantia, neque futura, neque virtus*.

Chap. 9. v. 31. We do not read in that ancient Copy the first δικαιοσύνης, nor the Word *justitiæ* in the same place in the ancient Vulgar.

Chap. 10. v. 1. instead of these Words ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐστίν, we read in that ancient Copy ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ, and in the ancient Vulgar *pro illis*, which is also in our Vulgar, but therein there is *fit* added. Vers. 8. after λέγει we read χεῖρ, and in the two Vulgars *Scriptura*. Vers. 17. instead of Θεῷ there is in the ancient Copy Χεῖρ, and in the two Vulgars *Christi*. Beza, (h) who also did read Χεῖρ in his three Copies, does testify, that he does not approve of this reading. There is nothing more ordinary in those ancient Greek Copies than

(h) Invenimus quidem in tribus exemplaribus; sed tamen vix possum probare. Bez. Annot. in Epist. ad Rom. c. 9. v. 17.

the enterchanging of these three Words, $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\iota}$, because they are there written by way of Contraction thus, $\Theta\bar{\tau}$, $\kappa\bar{\tau}$, $\chi\bar{\tau}$, which gave occasion to the Transcribers to put one frequently for another. V. 20. we read not $\alpha\upsilon\delta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ χ , nor in the Latin Version *audet* $\&$; besides, this makes nothing for the sense.

Chap. 11. v. 6. we do not read in the ancient Copies these words, $\epsilon\iota\ \delta\ \epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\upsilon\varsigma$, $\epsilon\kappa\ \epsilon\tilde{\nu}\ \epsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\ \epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\upsilon\varsigma$ $\epsilon\kappa\ \epsilon\tilde{\nu}\ \epsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\upsilon\varsigma$. But if it be by Works then it is no more Grace, otherwise work is no work. Neither are they expressed in the two Vulgars. Beza (i) observes that they were not in Origen, St. Chrysostom, nor St. Ambrose, but that he read them in all the Greek Copies except that of Clermont. He is of the Judgment that we ought to read them to compleat the Antithesis that is in that place betwixt Works and Faith: nevertheless Erasmus is for the ancient Reading, which he had more strongly confirmed if he had read the two ancient Copies to which the ancient Latin Version is annexed. Grotius followed the Opinion of Erasmus, *Hæc rectè* (saith this Critick) *desunt in manuscripto, nec legitur in Latinis Interpres, sed nec Origines, nec Ambrosius, nec Chrysostomus.* *Epist. ad Rom. c. 11. v. 6.* Esfius durst not be so positive in this matter; he does only say, (k) that it is probable enough that those Words were added to the Text: nevertheless he does reject the Opinion of Cajetan, who believed that they were wanting in the Vulgar. Vers. 12. we read not in the ancient Copy $\epsilon\delta\omega\tilde{\nu}$ $\alpha\pi\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, nor in the annexed Latin Version *gentium Apostolus*, but it is only written in the bottom of the Page by the same hand with the Book, with the ordinary mark of reference.

Chap. 12. v. 11. This Contraction $\kappa\bar{\omega}$, which is in the ancient Copy gave occasion to a different Reading in the Greek Copies; for some did read it $\kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\omega$, Lord, and others $\kappa\alpha\iota\omega$, Time: but we ought to read it $\kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\omega$; and it is in the two Vulgars *Domino*, agreeable to that Reading. Vers. 14. these Words $\tau\acute{o}\ \delta\iota\omega\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$.. are also transposed in that ancient Copy, $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\mu\grave{\epsilon}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ $\tau\acute{o}\ \delta\iota\omega\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\varsigma$. It is also in the ancient Latin Version according to this Transposition, *& nolite maledicere, benedicite persequentes vos.* Vers. 17. These words which we read in the Vulgar at this day, *non tantum coram Deo, sed*

(i) *Hanc partem non legunt vetus Interpres, nec Origenes, nec Chrysostomus, nec Ambrosius, quam tamen summo consensu in Græcis codicibus inveni, Claromontano excepto — Et mihi quidem planè videtur necessaria explendæ operum & fidei antithesi.* Bez. ibid. c. 11. v. 6.

(k) *Ut satís probabile sit additamentum esse Græci cuiuspiam ad textum — Quocirca Cajetano non assentior affirmanti integram hanc sententiam deesse in Latino textu, cum verius existimem simpliciter eam redundare.* Est Comm. in Epist. ad Rom. c. 11. v. 6.

etiam, are not in the ancient Vulgar, nor in the ancient Greek any more than in the new.

Chap. 13. v. 5. We do not read in the ancient Copy ἀνάγκη, nor in the ancient Vulgar *necessitate*, but only *subditi estote*, ὑποτάσσασθε. Nevertheless they have added in the Margin of the Latin *necessitate*, and at the bottom of the Page in the Greek ἀνάγκη. Vers. 9. we do not read in that Copy ἡ ψευδομαρτυρία, nor in the ancient Vulgar *non falsum testimonium dices*. Vers. 12. instead of ἀποθνήσκει, we read in the same Copy ἀποβαλάμεθα, which does not change the sense. In the same Verse, instead of ὅπλα, arms, there is ἔργα, and in the ancient Vulgar *opera*, works.

Chap. 14. v. 9 these Words ὁ ἀπὸ θανάτου ἔζησεν ὁ ἀπὸ θανάτου ὁ ἀνίστη, and it is in the ancient Latin Version which is annexed to it, & *vixit & mortuus est & resurrexit*. We read not in our Vulgar *vixit*. He who revised it did in all probability believe that the Word ἀνέζησεν or ἔζησεν as it is in the ancient Copy, had the same signification with ἀνίστη, and that these were Readings of the same Word. Vers. 10. after the latter ὅτι there is an Addition of these Words, ἐν τῷ μὲν ἰδίῳ, and in conformity to this Reading it is in the ancient Vulgar *in non manducando*. In the same Verse instead of Χεῖρ we read Θεῷ, and in the ancient Vulgar *Dei*. Vers. 11. after ἀλλήλους, φυλάξωμεν is added; and according to this Reading we find in the two Vulgars *custodiamus*.

Chap. 15. v. 11. after the Word πάλιν we read λίγην. we do not read ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ, nor in the ancient Vulgar *in*. Vers. 19. instead of Θεῷ there is ἀγίῳ, and in the two Vulgars and we find that the following Words are transposed and somewhat changed, in this manner, ὅτι πεπληρωθήσεται ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ μέχρι τοῦ Ὠκεανοῦ, and in the ancient Vulgar, *ita ut compleretur ab Ierusalem usque in Illyricum & in circuitu*. There are some other Transpositions in the same Chapter which I omit, because they are of no importance. We have reason to believe that those Words were transposed to make the sense the clearer. Vers. 24. we do not read ἐλθόμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, which is not expressed in the two Vulgars. Vers. 27. we do not read ἐνδοκίμῃ, nor in the ancient Vulgar *placuit enim eis*. Vers. 29. we cannot find ἐναγκαλίῳ, nor in the ancient Version *Evangeliis*. Vers. 30. after the Word περιστάχαις we read ὑμῶν, and in the two Vulgars *vestris*. Vers. 32. instead of Θεῷ there is Χεῖρ Ἰησοῦ, and in the ancient Vulgar *Christi Jesu*: in the same place, instead of these Words ζωοποιήσωμαι ὑμῖν, we read in the ancient Copy ἀναψύξω μὲν ὑμῶν, and in the ancient Vulgar *refrigerem vobiscum*. V. 33. after εἰρήνῃς there is ἦτοι added, and *sit* in the Vulgar.

Chap.

Chap. 16. v. 2. after the word αὐτῇ, we read the following words transposed (and somewhat changed) after this manner, καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν, and it is also in the ancient Vulgar *mibi & multis aliis*. Ver. 3. instead of πελοκίλλαν we read πελοκα, and in the two Vulgars *priscam*. In the same Verse there is a Transposition, which seems to have been made on purpose to avoid an Hyperbate; for after the word Ἰησοῦ we read καὶ πάλιν καὶ οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν, and in the Vulgar, & domesticam eorum Ecclesiam. After which we read these other words, πάντες ὑμεῖς, &c. Ver. 5. instead of εἰς χεῖρὸν, we read in the ancient Copy ἐν χεῖρῳ. There is nothing more ordinary amongst the Greek Manuscripts than this various Reading; and therefore we ought not, upon such occasions to take so much notice of the reading of the Copies as of the Sense, whether we read εἰς or ἐν. So in the following Verse, instead of εἰς ἡμᾶς we read ἐν ὑμῖν, and in the two Vulgars *in vobis*, there being a double difference in these words: and it does also happen often enough, that the Transcribers do put these two Pronouns ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς, the one for the other. Ver. 15. instead of Ὀλυμπῶν there is in the ancient Copy Ὀλυμπῶν, and in the two Vulgars *Olympiadem*. Ver. 16. we do not read these words ἀσπάζοντα ὑμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ χεῖρ, nor these in the ancient Latin Version, *salutant vos omnes Ecclesie Christi*. Ver. 17. instead of παρακαλῶ there is ἐρωτῶ, and in the two Vulgars *rogo*. In the same place, after ἀδελφοὶ there is an Addition of ἀσφαλῶς, and in the ancient Vulgar of *diligenter*: moreover, after εὐαδῶν we read ὡς ἂν, and in the ancient Latin Version *dicentes vel facientes*. Ver. 18. we do not read καὶ ἐνλογίας, nor in the ancient Vulgar *benefactiones*. Ver. 21. after the latter μὴ there is added καὶ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πανταχοῦ τοῦ χεῖρ, and in the ancient Vulgar, & *Ecclesie universae Christi*. In the last place, Ver. 24. after αἰῶνας, we read in the ancient Copy καὶ αἰῶνων, and in the two Vulgars *seculorum*.

It may appear by the different Readings which we have now mentioned in the two preceding Chapters, how we are to judge of the ancient Greek Copies that were before St. Jerom, especially in the Western Churches, and to which the ancient Latin Version which was used in those Churches was agreeable.

It is true that the Vulgar at this day does frequently agree with those ancient Greek Copies; but it does also differ from them very often: and therefore it cannot be thought (according to the Opinion of F. Morin and F. Amelote) that we must always prefer the reading of the Vulgar in those places where it does agree with those ancient Copies, seeing there are so many other places where it differs from them. If that Greek be the true Original of the Apostles, as those two Authors seem to have insinuated, it ought to be the

etiam, are not in the ancient Vulgar, nor in the ancient Greek any more than in the new.

Chap. 12. v. 5. We do not read in the ancient Copy ἀνάγκη, nor in the ancient Vulgar *necessitate*, but only *subditi estote, υποτάσσου*. Nevertheless they have added in the Margin of the *Latin necessitate*, and at the bottom of the Page in the Greek ἀνάγκη. Vers. 9. we do not read in that Copy ἡ ἀποδομις, nor in the ancient Vulgar *non falsum testimonium dices*. Vers. 12. instead of ἀποδομις, we read in the same Copy ἀποκαλώμεθα, which does not change the sense. In the same Verse, instead of ὅπλα, arms, there is ἔργα, and in the ancient Vulgar *opera, works*.

Chap. 14. v. 9 these Words ὃ ἀπὸ θανάτου ... are thus transposed, ὃ ἔζησεν ὃ ἀπέθανεν ὃ ἀνέστη, and it is in the ancient *Latin Version* which is annexed to it, & *vixit & mortuus est & resurrexit*. We read not in our Vulgar *vixit*. He who revised it did in all probability believe that the Word ἀνέστησεν or ἔζησεν as it is in the ancient Copy, had the same signification with ἀνέστη, and that these were Readings of the same Word. Vers. 10. after the latter ὃ there is an Addition of these Words, ἐν τῷ μὲν ἔδειν, and in conformity to this Reading it is in the ancient Vulgar *in non manducando*. In the same Verse, instead of Χεῖρ we read Θεῶ, and in the ancient Vulgar *Dei*. Ver. 19. after ἀλλήλους, φυλάξωμεν is added; and according to this Reading, we find in the two Vulgars *custodiamus*.

Chap. 15. v. 11. after the Word πάλιν we read λίαν. Vers. 13. we do not read ἐν τῷ πισδεῖν, nor in the ancient Vulgar *in credendo*. Vers. 19. instead of Θεῶ there is ἁγίω, and in the two Vulgars *sancti*, and we find that the following Words are transposed and somewhat changed, in this manner, ὥστε πληρῶσθαι ὑμῶν ἵνα πληροῦσθε ἡμεῖς ὡς ἡμεῖς ὡς ἡμεῖς, and in the ancient Vulgar, *ita ut completeretur ab Jerusalem usque in Illyricum & in circuitu*. There are some other Transpositions in the same Chapter which I omit, because they are of no importance. We have reason to believe that those Words were transposed to make the sense the clearer. Vers. 24. we do not read ἐλδοσμαι τοῦ υἱοῦ, which is not expressed in the two Vulgars. Ver. 27. we do not read ἐνδοκίμῃ, nor in the ancient Vulgar *placuit enim ei*. Vers. 29. we cannot find ἐναγγελίᾳ, nor in the ancient Version *Evangeliis*. Vers. 30. after the Word προσδεχῶν we read ὑμῶν, and in the two Vulgars *vestris*. Vers. 32. instead of Θεῶ there is Χεῖρ Ἰησοῦ, and in the ancient Vulgar *Christi Jesu*: in the same place, instead of these Words καταπαύσμαι ὑμῶν, we read in the ancient Copy ἀναψύξω μεθ' ὑμῶν, and in the ancient Vulgar *refrigerem vobiscum*. V. 33. after εἰρήνη there is ἦτω added, and *fit* in the Vulgar.

Chap. 16. v. 2. after the word αὐτῇ, we read the following words transposed (and somewhat changed) after this manner, καὶ ἡμῶ καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν, and it is also in the ancient Vulgar *mibi & multis aliis*. Ver. 3. instead of πελοκιδαν we read πελοκα, and in the two Vulgars *priscam*. In the same Verse there is a Transposition, which seems to have been made on purpose to avoid an Hyperbate; for after the word Ἰησοῦ we read καὶ πάλιν καὶ ὅλον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν, and in the Vulgar, & *domesticam eorum Ecclesiam*. After which we read these other words, πάντες ὑμεῖς, &c. Ver. 5. instead of εἰς χεῖρ, we read in the ancient Copy ἐν χεῖρ. There is nothing more ordinary amongst the Greek Manuscripts than this various Reading; and therefore we ought not, upon such occasions to take so much notice of the reading of the Copies as of the Sense, whether we read εἰς or ἐν. So in the following Verse, instead of εἰς ἡμᾶς we read ἐν ὑμῶν, and in the two Vulgars *in vobis*, there being a double difference in these words: and it does also happen often enough, that the Transcribers do put these two Pronouns ἡμῖς and ὑμεῖς, the one for the other. Ver. 15. instead of Ὀλυμπῶν there is in the ancient Copy Ὀλυμπῶν, and in the two Vulgars *Olympiadem*. Ver. 16. we do not read these words ἀσπάζοντα ὑμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς χεῖρ, nor these in the ancient Latin Version, *salutant vos omnes Ecclesie Christi*. Ver. 17. instead of παρακαλῶ there is ἱερῶ, and in the two Vulgar *rogo*. In the same place, after ἀδελφοί there is an Addition of ἀσφαλῶς, and in the ancient Vulgar of *diligenter*: moreover, after εὐαδεν we read λέγοντας ἡ, and in the ancient Latin Version *dicentes vel facientes*. Ver. 18. we do not read καὶ ἐνδοξίας, nor in the ancient Vulgar *benedictiones*. Ver. 21. after the latter μὴ there is added καὶ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πανταυ τῆς χεῖρ, and in the ancient Vulgar, & *Ecclesie universae Christi*. In the last place, Ver. 24. after αἰῶνας, we read in the ancient Copy ὅς αἰῶνας, and in the two Vulgar *seculorum*.

It may appear by the different Readings which we have now mentioned in the two preceding Chapters, how we are to judge of the ancient Greek Copies that were before St. Jerom, especially in the Western Churches, and to which the ancient Latin Version which was used in those Churches was agreeable.

It is true that the Vulgar at this day does frequently agree with those ancient Greek Copies; but it does also differ from them very often: and therefore it cannot be thought (according to the Opinion of F. Morin and F. Amelote) that we must always prefer the reading of the Vulgar in those places where it does agree with those ancient Copies, seeing there are so many other places where it differs from them. If that Greek be the true Original of the Apostles, as those two Authors seem to have insinuated, it ought to be the

Original throughout, and we must consequently entirely adhere to the ancient Vulgar which is exactly agreeable to it. Yet St. *Jerom* believed that it was absolutely necessary to correct it, seeing it was very defective. If I were not afraid of being too tedious, I would here produce the various Readings of that ancient *Greek* Copy upon St. *Paul's* Epistles, but I shall observe them more conveniently in the second part of this Critical History, when we shall examine the Version of the ancient *Latin* Interpreter, and shall take particular notice of such Places as agree with the ancient *Greek* Copies that were extant before St. *Jerom*.

CHAP. XXXII.

Of other Greek Manuscript Copies of the New Testament. Examples of the various Readings of those Manuscripts; with Critical Reflections on those Differences.

WE find in our Libraries several *Greek* Copies of the New Testament which were written out by the *Greeks*, and were in use amongst them. Although they differ in sundry places from one another, the most of those differences are but of small importance. They agree together in this, that they are very little like those which we have last observed, that were copied by the *Latins*. This I observed in reading many of those Copies which are in the King's and in Mr. *Colbert's* Library. It is true that I found none in those two Libraries that were so ancient as those other *Greek* Copies to which they joyned the ancient *Latin* Version which was before St. *Jerom*: yet this does not hinder but that there were some of the like Antiquity; but they are very rare. I believe that we ought to reckon the Copy of the *Vatican* in the number, of which some Criticks have made mention, and whereof they have also observed some different Readings in their Works.

The Copy which is commonly called the *Alexandrine*, because it came from *Alexandria* in *Egypt*, is likewise very ancient. Some of the *English* Nation, after *Cyrrillus Lucar*, have observed that that Book which contains the Old and the New Testament in *Greek* was written more than thirteen hundred Years ago by an *Egyptian* Lady called *Thecle*. But they produce no certain proofs of this Antiquity. It was the Interest of the Patriarch *Cyrrillus*, who made

made a Present of that Bible to the King of *England*, to make it as ancient as he could. There have been many *Thecle's*, and they also gave that Name to some *Roman Ladies*, who retired into solitude in the East, where their great Piety was admired by the whole World: These Ladies understood the *Greek Language*, and were curious to read the Holy Scripture in that Tongue. There were also Monasteries consecrated to St. *Thecle*; and it might very well be, that that Copy belonged to some Monastery of that name: However it be, it cannot be denied, but that it is very ancient. Yet it differs from those other *Greek Copies*, which were writ out by the Latins, as it is easie to judge by the various Readings, which the *English* have Printed in their Polyglott Bible: *Grotius* has also made mention of a good part of those various Readings upon the New Testament: We shall nevertheless observe, that this Critick is not always exact in his citations. In short, I cannot give full assurance, that that Manuscript called the *Alexandrine*, and that of the Vatican, cannot be reckoned in the number of those, which were writ out by Latin *Amanuenses* in those Ancient times.

I make no question, but that Cardinal *Ximenes* consulted the most Ancient Copies of the New Testament, when he published his Edition. But it is to be feared, that some of the readings of those Ancient Copies were inserted therein, under a pretext, that he found them more agreeable to our Vulgar. It is also possible, that *Stephen's* Copy, which was compared in *Italy*, with many *Greek Manuscripts*, does likewise contain some readings of those same Copies which were revised, and to which they annexed the Ancient Latin Version. The same judgment ought to be made of the Sixteen Copies, which the Marquis of *Veles* had consulted, and whereof some do in many places, agree with our Vulgar: It is fit to make all these Observations in general, to supply in some sort the negligence of those Learned Men, who were not at the pains to give us particular marks of distinction, to know what were good and what were bad amongst their Manuscripts. *Erasmus* and *Beza*, who had perused several of those *Greek Copies*, and who signalized their diligence in this matter, were frequently mistaken, when they spoke of their Manuscripts. They were ignorant of the distinction, that we formerly mentioned, betwixt two sorts of *Greek Copies* of the New Testament. For what remains, seeing I have given several examples of the various readings that were writ out by the Latins, it will be very fit, to produce in this place, some instances of the various readings of other *Greek Copies*. And because there have been several collections already made, whereby it may be known wherein those variations do consist; I shall confine my self to such as are the
princi

principal of them, and upon which it will be needful to make some Critical reflections.

Chap. I. of St. *Matthew*, v. 11. we read in the Ordinary Greek Copies, Ἰωάνης υἱ ἑρμών καὶ Ἰεζερίαν, *Josiah* begat *Jechoniah*. The Ancient Latin Interpreter, the *Syriack* Version and other Translations of the Eastern Church, do confirm this Reading: But *Robert Stephen* did read it in one of his Copies, Ἰωάνης υἱ ἑρμών καὶ Ἰαννίμ, Ἰαννίμ υἱ ἑρμών καὶ Ἰεζερίαν, which reading is found in many other Greek Manuscripts, cited in the sixth Tome of the Polyglott Bible of England, with this difference, that instead of Ἰαννίμ, it is in those Manuscripts Ἰωαννίμ. *Flaccius Illyricus* has inserted it in his Greek Edition of the New Testament, and it is also put in the Version of *Erasmus*, which was joyned thereto upon its being revised according to the Greek, *Josias autem genuit Jakim, Jakim autem genuit Jechoniam*. *Simon de Coline* has likewise followed this reading in his Greek New Testament, according to which *Castalio* has put in his Latin Version

Nov. Test.
Scaft.
Cast. edit.
ann. 1556.

Josias Joacimum, Joacimus Jechoniam. *Beza* did also approve of the reading of *Stephen's* Manuscript, as it appeared by the first Editions of his Version of the New Testament, where it is, *Josias autem genuit Jakim, Jakim autem genuit Jechoniam*. Nevertheless he leaves the ordinary Reading in the Greek Text: But he changed his Opinion afterwards, as appeared by his great Notes, in which he does assure us, (a) that this Reading which he had once followed, was against the truth of the History, although he had found it owned in one of *Stephen's* Manuscripts, and approved by the testimony of *James le Fevre*, and of *Martin Bucer*, who had seen (as he believes) that Manuscript, into which (b) an error had slipped, as he thought. He is of the mind, that we ought to reform the place in this manner. Ἰωάνης υἱ ἑρμών καὶ Ἰαννίμ, καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, Ἰαννίμ υἱ ἑρμών καὶ Ἰεζερίαν, ἐκ τῆς μετὰ αὐτοῦ βασιλείας. He adds, that he had amended his Version by this Standard. Yet he does follow, in his own latter Editions, as well in the Greek as in the Latin, the ordinary Greek Edition.

Nov. Test.
Bez. Gr.
& Lat. in
8. ann.
1565.

Maldonat the Jesuit, in his Commentary upon this place of St. *Matthew*, did prefer *Stephen's* Manuscript or rather that of *James le Fevre*, to the ordinary Greek and to the Vulgar. He chiefly depends on the Authority of St. *Epiphanius*, who alledged, that in that

(a) Quam lectionem aliquando secutus sum, sed hinc obstat historiae veritas. Bez. Annot. in c. i. Matth. v. 11.

(b) In hac quoque lectione illius manuscripti codicis, alioqui verâ & germanâ lectione, error inolevit. sed levis, & sic emendandus est, ut nunc transtuli, Ἰωάνης υἱ ἑρμών. -- Bez. ibid.

place, there was an error in the Vulgar Greek Copies; because the Transcribers, who perceived, that the name of *Jechonias* was mark'd four times, did imagine with themselves, that that repetition was superfluous. I do agree (saith *Maldonat*) with *St. Epiphanius*, in his Opinion, that there was an omission of the Transcriber in that place: Yet I do not reckon with him, that it does consist in these words, *Jechonias begat Jechonias*, but in these, *Joachim begat Jechonias*. — And therefore, I think that this place ought to be amended thus; *Josias begat Joachim and his Brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon, and Joachim begat Jechonias*.

But notwithstanding the Authority of some Greek Manuscripts, which confirm this Reading, I am persuaded that we ought to keep the ordinary Reading in the Text and in the Versions, because it is the most ancient and the most plain. That other reading was brought in by the Scholiasts, who noted in the Margin of their Copies, that one generation was wanting in that place; and at the same time they marked it in their Scholium or Marginal Note, which was afterwards put in the Text. Indeed *St. Epiphanius* does cite no ancient Copy, to give authority to his amendment: On the contrary, he does suppose, that it was extant in the Copies of his Time, as it is in the ordinary Greek Copies at this day: He only says, that they who have a mind to consult exact Copies, τὰ ἀκριβὴς ἢ ἀντιγράφων, will approve his correction. But besides that he makes mention of none in particular, he falls into manifest errors, and such as contradict the History of the Old Testament: He seem'd to correct his Vulgar reading for no other reason, but because, *St. Matthew* having divided the Genealogy of Jesus Christ into three Classes, every one whereof ought to contain fourteen Persons (d) he only found thirteen in the third Class. Which he imputes to the Transcribers, who perceiving the name of *Jechonias* repeated, believed that the second *Jechonias* ought not to be reckoned in the number of those

(c) *Epiphanius* in hoc assentior, ut existimem scriptorum vitio aliqua verba intercidisse, quibus significetur *Joachim* filium *Josie* genuisse *Jechoniam*. In eo non assentior, quod non existimo deesse hæc, *Jechonias* autem genuit *Jechoniam*; sed hæc, *Joachim* autem genuit *Jechoniam*. -- Itaque totum locum sic restituendum puto, *Josias* autem genuit *Joachim* & fratres ejus in transmigratione *Babylonis*, (quemadmodum *Staphylus* affirmat se in antiquo quodam Græco codice legisse) *Joachim* autem genuit *Jechoniam*. *Mald. Comm. in c. i. Matth. v. 11.*

(d) Ὁ ὅτι τὸ ἀριθμὸς ἐν τῇ διατριβῇ τῶν ἁγίων ἐνέσχετο καὶ τὸ διαδοχικὸν ὀνομαστικὸν τὸ πλήρωμα ἔχον, ἀλλὰ διαλείπων ἐπισυνῆνεν πρὸς Ἰεζεκίαν ἀπὸ Ἰεζεκιᾶ ἐτέρου τὸ αὐτὸ ἐνεργήσας ἐννοῶν τὸ ἀριθμὸν διαδοχικῶν ἢ. Οὐκ ὡς ὁ διοικητὴς ἀπὸ ἀριθμοῦ συστή. *Epiph. lib. i. adv. Hær. tit. de Epic. n. 8.*

Persons, that belonged to the Genealogy of Jesus Christ; whereas in truth, it did appertain thereto.

St. *Jerome* observed something of the like nature, at the beginning of his Commentaries upon *Daniel*, where he says, (e) that it seems that there is one generation wanting in St. *Matthew*, because the second Class or Order begins at *Joakim* the Son of *Josias*, and the third begins at *Joachim* the Son of *Joakim*, and thus he answers *Porphyrus*, who had accused St. *Matthew* of falshood in that place: But his does not establish this reading by the Authority of any Greek Copy. The only thing he aimed at, was to make an Answer to *Porphyrus*, whose objection does suppose, that the ancient Copies do perfectly agree with the ordinary Greek at this day. They might very well illustrate that Passage of St. *Matthew* by some Note, but it is not at all allowable to insert that Note in the Text. And therefore St. *Jerome* has not inserted it in his Latin Edition, when he corrected it by good Manuscripts, according to the order he had received from Pope *Damasus*: Which is a new Proof, that we ought to keep to the reading of the ordinary Greek which is the most ancient. That Father did content himself to make, in his Commentaries upon St. *Matthew*, such an observation as we have already mentioned, without changing the Text of that Evangelist in any Thing. *Si voluerimus*, (saith he) *Jechoniam* in fine primæ tessaredicadis ponere, in sequente non erunt quatuordecim, sed tredecim. Sciamus igitur *Jechoniam* priorem ipsum esse, quem & *Joakim*; secundum autem filium, non patrem, quorum prior per k. & m. sequens per ch. & n. scribitur, quod scriptorum vitio & longitudine temporum apud Græcos Latinosque confusum est. He does suppose in this observation, that some did read with *Epiphanius*, two several *Jechonias* whom he does distinguish by writing them differently according to the reading of the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament. But this amendment is Founded upon no Copy of St. *Matthew*, unless it be such as has been reformed: For what remains, I do not know how the reading was in those Greek and Latin Copies of the New Testament, that were before St. *Jerome*. For the nineteen first Verses of St. *Matthew* are wanting in the Cambridge Copy, which does only begin at the word *Ἐξαδάκρυ* v. 20. of the first Chapter.

(e) In Evangelio secundum Matthæum una videtur deesse generatio, quia secunda *ἡρώδης* in *Joakim* desinit filio *Josia*, & tertia incipit à *Joachim* filio *Joakim*. Quod ignorans *Porphyrus*, calumniam struit Ecclesiæ; suam ostendens imperitiam, dum Evangelistæ Matthæi arguere nititur falsitatem. Hieron. init. Comm. in Dan.

The Author of the imperfect Work upon St. *Matthew*, who likewise did read as we do, in the ordinary *Greek*, has observed, that it is otherwise in the Book of the *Kings*, (f) and the order of the Genealogy ought to be expressed thus, *Josias* begat *Eliachim*, who was afterwards called *Joachim*, and *Joachim* begat *Jechonias*. He only takes notice of the order that that Genealogy ought to have, according to the History of the New Testament. He does not, for all that, reform the ordinary Text of St. *Matthew*: For he adds, (g) that that does not hinder, but that *Jechonias* who was the Grandson of *Josias*, might have been called his Son, because it was very ordinary to give the name of Sons to Grandsons.

Chap. 2. of St. *Matthew*, v. 17. where we read in the ordinary *Greek*, *καὶ Ἰησοῦς*, Robert Stephen did read in one of his Manuscripts, *καὶ υἱὸς δὲ Ἰεζεκιῶ*, which reading is confirmed by another ancient Manuscript, cited by Mr. *Salbert*, and in the *Cambridge Copy*: Although *Beza* (b) found that reading only in one Manuscript; yet he does prefer it to the other, because it appeared to him to be St. *Matthew's* Stile, and he believed, that there is a great force in that expression, which declares to us, that the Lord does speak by the mouth of his Prophets. But it is much more probable, that these words *υἱὸς δὲ* were added in the *Cambridge Copy*, there being very few other Copies where it is extant. It cannot be therefore any longer thought with any assurance, that they are of St. *Matthew's* Stile, seeing that Evangelist does not express them in many places, where that same manner of speech does occur. In short, he would disparage his own judgment, who would leave the ordinary reading of the *Greek Copies*, and embrace one reading, which is only founded on a very small number of Copies, under a pretext that they contain an expression, which seems to have more force. For according to the Laws of Criticks, the reading which is most plain, and is withal confirmed by the plurality of Copies, ought to be accounted the best: And therefore, St. *Jerome* did rather choose to follow those *Greek Copies* than the ancient *Vulgar*.

(f) Ergo talis est ordo: *Josias* genuit *Eliachim*, postea vocatum *Joachim*. *Joachim* autem genuit *Jechoniam*. Auct. Oper. imperf. in Matth. cap. 1. v. 11.

(g) Nec obest quod filius *Josie* dictus est, cum sit nepos, quoniam & nepotes recte filii dicuntur. Id. ibid.

(h) Probatur hæc lectio quam securus sum manuscriptorum exemplaris auctoritate, & ita solere loqui *Matthæum* superiora ostendunt. Certe magna vis est horum verborum, ex quibus intelligimus non ipsos Prophetas, sed Dominum ore Prophetarum loqui. Bez. ad cap. 2. Matth. v. 17.

In the same Chapter, 2. v. 18. although we read in all the *Greek* Copies of the New Testament, ἐν Ῥαμᾷ, in *Rama*, as the proper name of a Place, *Origen* has observed (i) that that Word does signify an *high place*, and that it is in some Copies, ἐν τῇ ὕψιλῃ, i. e. *on high*. But this reading is only extant in the ancient *Alexandrine* Copy of the Septuagint Version, where the signification of the Hebrew word *Rama* is put: St. *Jerome* also, who has in *excelsa*, in his new Translation from the *Hebrew*, has left the words, (in *Rama*) in his ancient Latin Edition which he had taken from the Septuagint; and he has kept the same reading in his Edition of the Gospels. He only observed in his Commentary, (k) that *Rama* is not the proper name of a place which was near to *Gabaa*, but that this word does signify *high*, so that the sense of the Passage according to his mind, will run thus, *A voice was heard on high*, that is to say, that that voice was spread far and wide. Further, in the same verse, we do not read ἐν τῇ ὕψιλῃ in a Manuscript of Mr. *Colbert's* Library, nor in *Justin Martyr*, who made mention of that Passage in his Dialogue against *Tryphon the Jew*: Neither is it found in the *Vulgar*, although it is in the *Ancient Vulgar*, and in the *Greek* of the *Cambridge* Copy.

Cod. MSS.
Bibl. Coll.
n. 2467.

Chap. 3. v. 11. These words καὶ πάλιν, are not found in a great number of *Greek* Manuscript Copies, *Robert Stephen* did not read them in seven of his, and there are also seven others marked in the Polyglott of *England* which have them not. Besides, I have not found them in two Copies that belong to Mr. *Colbert*: But they are in the *Cambridge* Copy and the two *Vulgars*, St. *Jerome* having kept them in his new Edition. He has likewise explained them in his Commentary, without observing that there was any variety of reading upon that Passage. The truth is, the most *Ancient Greek* and *Latin* Fathers had no other reading; which made *Erasmus* conjecture that some had taken them away from their Copies, because there were some Hereticks who Baptized with *fire*. But this conjecture has no colour, for we read the same words, Chap. 3. v. 16. of St. *Luke*, in all the *Greek* Copies: *Luke* of *Bruges* does think that they were possibly taken from this Evangelist, and that the Transcribers did insert them in St. *Matthew*. *Maldonat* has very well observed, that the particle καὶ, is not a *conjunctive particle*, but *explicative*; and that

(i) Τὸ πονὺ ὕψιλῃν σημαίνει τὸ Ῥαμᾶ· διὸ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγραφοῦσι βιβλίοις ὅπου γέγραπται, ἐν τῇ ὕψιλῃ ἡκέδω. Orig. Cat. Gr. in Matth. 2. 18.

(k) Quod autem dicitur in Rama, non putemus loci nomen esse juxta Gabaa, sed rama excelsum interpretatur, ut sit sensus, Vox in excelsa audita est, id est, longe lateque dispersa. Hieron. Comm. in c. 2. Matth. v. 18.

the explication of the preceding words was added, to shew that in that place there was no mention made of the Spirit in general, but of the descent of the same Spirit in the form of *Fire*, the day of the *Pentecost*. And that which may give us cause to suspect, that these words *ἐν πνεύματι* have been added, as well in *S. Luke*, as in *S. Matthew* by way of Explication, is, that we only read in *S. Mark*, Chap. 1. vers. 8. *ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς ἀκούομεν*. Nevertheless there are two Manuscripts quoted in the sixth Tome of the Polyglott of *England*, where there is also found *ἐν πνεύματι*, in this Evangelist. But in what manner soever the Reading be in this Evangelist, the reading of the Gospel according to *S. Matthew* cannot be regulated by it, seeing the latter is oftentimes only abridged by the former.

Chap. 5. v. 22. We read in all the *Greek Copies*, *εἰκὼν*, without a cause; and it was also in the ancient *Vulgar* agreeable to the *Greek Cambridge Copy*. Yet *S. Augustin*, who had read it in the *Latin* *Aug. lib. 1. Retr. c. 19.* Copies of his time, retracted his Opinion concerning it, because he found it not in the *Greek Copies*. *Codices enim Græci* (saith that Father) *non habent sine causâ, sicut hic positum est*. It is apparent, that he passed by the ancient *Vulgar*, to embrace the Opinion of *S. Jerom*, who in his new Edition has left out the words, *without cause*, and who has also observed in his Commentary upon that place, (1) that they are truly in some Copies, but that they are not in the true Copies. And therefore he is of the mind, that they ought to be left out of all the *Greek Copies* that have been cited hitherto, there is only that of the *Vatican*, mentioned by *Luke of Bruges*, where *εἰκὼν* is not found. The ancient Author of the *Syriack* Version did also read it in the *Greek Copy* which he made use of for making his Translation. For he has kept the *Greek* word which he has only written in *Syriack* Characters. The most ancient Fathers as well *Greek* as *Latin* did also read the same word in their Copies. There were only some *Latins*, since *S. Jerom's* Correction, who believed that it did not belong to the Text. It would possibly be more proper to re-establish it in the *Vulgar*, which in that Passage is contrary to Antiquity and to many Copies.

In the same Chapter, v. 27. *Robert Stephen* did not read in seven of his Manuscripts *τοῖς ἀγγέλοις*, to the Ancients. Neither is it found in some other Copies that are marked in the Polyglott Bible of *England*. I also observed that it is not in three Manuscripts of

(1) In quibusdam codicibus additur sine causâ. Ceterum in veris definita sententia est, & ita penitus tollitur... Radendum est ergo sine causâ. Hieron. Comm. in cap. 5. Matth.

Cod. MSS. Bibl. Colb. n. 2467. 4112. Monsieur Colbert's Library. Nevertheless S. Jerom has put it in his new Edition.

Cod. MSS. ex Bibl. Colb. n. 2259. The thirtieth Verse of the same Chapter is not in the ancient Cambridge Copy, nor in another quoted in the sixth Tome of the Polyglott of England. Neither did I read it in one of M. Colbert's Manuscripts. 'Tis probable that it is a mere omission of the Transcribers, in those Copies which was occasioned by this, that the twenty nine and thirty Verses do both end with the word *κίναρ*. Omissions of that sort are very ordinary.

Cod. MSS. Colb. n. 2467. In one of M. Colbert's Manuscripts we do not read in the forty fourth Verse of the same Chapter, these words, *Ευλογεῖτε τοὺς καταραζομένους ὑμᾶς καὶ οἷς μισοῦντες ὑμᾶς*. Bless them who curse you, do good to them who hate you. Neither do we read in the same Copy these other words which are in the same place, *καὶ τοῖς ἐπιθρονον καὶ*

Nic. Zeg. Epanorth. in cap. 5. Matth. v. 44. For them that despitefully use you and; as if they did signifie the same with those words that immediately follow. Nevertheless all this is found in the ancient Cambridge Copy. But S. Jerom has not expressed in his new Edition these first words, *ευλογεῖτε τοὺς καταραζομένους ὑμᾶς*. Zegerus believes that they were taken out of the sixth Chapter of S. Luke, and inserted in S. Matthew, *A studio quoque ex Luca cap. 6. huc translata sunt*.

Chap. 6. v. 4. These words *καὶ τοῖς φαρμακοῖς*, which S. Jerom has not expressed in his Edition, are not in the ancient Cambridge Copy. And Luke of Bruges has informed us, that he does not find them in the Vatican Copy. Besides, I have not read them in two of M. Colbert's Manuscripts: nevertheless S. Augustin does assure us, (m) that they did read the word *palam* in several Copies of his time, but that it was not expressed in the original Greek, which he prefers to all the Latin Copies. (Maldonat) (n) on the contrary does make use of those words of S. Augustin, as being of sufficient authority, for re-establishing that word in our Vulgar, alledging, that they did

(m) *Multa Latina exemplaria sic habent, Et pater tuus qui videt in abscondito, reddet tibi palam. Sed quia in Græcis quæ priora sunt non invenimus palam, non putamus hinc aliquid differendum esse. Aug. de Serm. Dom. in mont. lib. 2. cap. 2.*

(n) *Tempore Augustini Latini codices legebant, Græci non legebant, ut ille scribit. Itaque suspicio mihi est primos illos codices Græcos, ex quibus translatio Latina, quæ Ecclesia ante Hieronymum utebatur, facta fuerat, hæc verba legisse post scriptum vicio in Græcis abolita, in Latinis conservata. Hieronymus vero cum jam ipsius tempore in Græcis non legerentur, quia ad Græcorum, ut ipse ait, codicum veritatem Latinam editionem corriperebat, expunxisse de Latinâ quod non invenit in Græcâ. Nam legenda quidem esse ipsa indicat antithesis in abscondito, & in propatulo. Mald. Comm. in c. 6. Matth. v. 4.*

read it in the ancient Vulgar, before S. *Jerom* reformed it by the Copies of his time, from which these words ἐν τῷ φανεῷ were taken away, as that Jesuit does think. He adds, that the opposition that is betwixt these two, in *secret* and *openly*, does prove, that we ought to read in the *Greek*, ἐν τῷ φανεῷ, and consequently *palam* in the *Latin* Version. - But S. *Augustin* does only say, that he found the word *palam* in many Copies, and not in all. S. *Jerom* has kept in his Edition, the ancient reading of some *Greek* and *Latin* Copies. And thus *Maldonat* is mistaken, when he would persuade us, that that Father did correct the ancient Vulgar by the *Greek* Copies of his time, from which he had taken away ἐν τῷ φανεῷ. For the ancient *Cambridge* Copy does prove the contrary; besides that the Observation of S. *Augustin* does manifestly suppose, that they did not read *palam* in some *Latin* Copies of the ancient Vulgar. In short, the reason which that Jesuit brings from the opposition that is betwixt the words in *secret* and *openly*, is not at all conclusive. For whether we read the word *openly*, or no, the sense will be always perfect.

Moreover, the same words, ἐν τῷ φανεῷ, which are in the ordinary *Greek*, ver. 18. of the same sixth Chapter are not in any of *Robert Stephen's* Copies, nor in the ancient one of *Cambridge*, nor in that of the *Vatican*, nor in another ancient Copy cited by *Salbert*. Neither have I read them in three Manuscripts of *Monseigneur Colbert's* Library.

Cod. MSS.
Colb. n.
2464.
3947.
2259.

In the same Chapter, ver. 13. these words, ὅτι οὐ ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, *For thine is the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory for ever*, are not in one of *Robert Stephen's* Manuscripts, nor in the *Cambridge* Copy, nor in another ancient one quoted by *Salbert*. Yet they are extant in the most part of the *Greek* Copies, and also in some ancient Fathers of the *Greek* Church. But we ought here to prefer a few *Greek* Copies to a great number, because those few Copies are agreeable to the most ancient *Latin* Fathers. We further see evidently enough, that that which we read in the *Greek*, is an Addition that was taken from the *Greek* Liturgy, and inserted in the Copies which they did read in their Churches. The Church Bibles which are used in the same Churches have also occasioned many changes in the *Greek* Copies, as I have observed when I examined those *Lectionaries*.

In the twenty fifth verse of the same Chapter we do not read καὶ ἡ πόσις, and what ye shall drink. Neither are these words expressed in our Vulgar.

Cod. MSS.
Colb. n.
2467.

Chap. 8. ver. 13. *Robert Stephen* did read in three of his Manuscripts, after the word ἐκείνη these words, καὶ ἰουδαίας ὁ ἐκπότηρχος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ εὖρε τὸν πῶδα ὑγραίνοντα. And the Centu-

rion

tion having returned to his house at the same hour, found his servant whole. This Addition is likewise extant in some other Manuscripts marked in the sixth Tome of the Polyglott of *England*. And I found it in one of Monsieur Colbert's Manuscripts. But I could not know if it was also in the ancient *Cambridge* Copy, because some Leaves are wanting in that place.

Cod. MSS.
Colb. n.
2467.

Chap. 9. v. 13. we do not read *εἰς μετανοίαν*, to repentance in two of Robert Stephen's Manuscripts, nor in another belonging to M. Colbert's Library, nor in the ancient *Cambridge* Copy. S. Jerom, who did not find it in the ancient *Latin* Edition, did therefore omit it in his New Edition.

Cod. MSS.
Colb. n.
2467.

Chap. 10. v. 8. Robert Stephen did not read these words, *τίς τις ἐγείρετε, raise the dead*, in nine of his Copies; neither are they extant in some others that are quoted by Salbert, nor in three of Monsieur Colbert's. They are in the ancient *Cambridge* Copy, but transposed. S. Jerom has kept that Transposition in his New Edition, in the same manner as it was in the Ancient Vulgar. Nevertheless that Father, who, in his Commentary rehearses the words of this verse does not read *mortuos suscitare*. They were not in all appearance in the *Greek* Manuscripts which he believed to be the most exact. Yet he kept them in his *Latin* Edition, because he did not propose to himself an entire amendment of the Ancient Vulgar.

In the twelfth verse of the same Chapter we read after the word *αὐτῷ* in five of Robert Stephen's Manuscripts *λέγοντες εἰσαὶν πρὸ οἴκου τέτῳ*, saying, *Peace be to this house*. The same words are in the *Cambridge* Copy, and in some other Manuscripts quoted by Salbert. I found them also in one of Monsieur Colbert's. S. Jerom has left them out of his Edition, tho they are extant in our Vulgar at this day. Nevertheless, there are some *Latin* Manuscripts in which they are not found.

Cod. MSS.
Colb. n.
3947.

In the twenty third verse of the same Chapter, I found, after the word *ἄλλω*, this Addition in two of Colbert's, *Καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ διακίνοῦν ὑμᾶς, φέγετε εἰς πῶς ἄλλω*, But if they chase you from this city, flee ye to another. There is also something like this in two of Rob. Stephen's Manuscripts, and in the ancient *Cambridge* Copy. But S. Jerom put nothing of it in his New Edition, because he believed it to be an unprofitable Addition.

Cod. MSS.
Colb. n.
2467.
3947.

The fortieth verse of the same Chapter is wholly wanting in one of Monsieur Colbert's Manuscripts, which appeared to be an omission of the Transcriber, by reason of the verses 40, and 41. which begin with the same word, *ὁ δεχόμενος*. Neither do we find in the *Cambridge* Copy these other words, vers. 41. *καὶ ὁ δεχόμενος δίκαιον εἰς ὄνομα δίκαιου, μισθὸν δίκαιου λήψεται*, And he that receiveth a righteous man in the name

Cod. MSS.
Colb. n.
2467.

name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward. It seems they have left them out on purpose, because they appeared to have the same signification with the preceding words, *S. Jerom* restored them in his New Edition in conformity to other Greek Copies which were more correct.

Chap. 11. v. 1. We do not read in one of Monsieur Colbert's the word *διδυς*, Twelve. In the same Chap. v. 2. instead of *δύο*, there is in the Cambridge *διδυς*, and we read in the ancient Latin Version annexed to it, *per discipulos*, which Reading is agreeable to the Author of the Syriack Version, who has likewise in his Copy, *διδυς*. But *S. Jerom* has put in his new Edition, *duos de discipulis*, as it is in other Greek Manuscripts.

Chap. 12. v. 26. We do not read in one of Colbert's these words, *πῶς ἔσται βασιλεία αὐτοῦ*; How then shall his Kingdom stand? In the thirty first verse of the same Chapter we do not read in another of Colbert's, *τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* to Men. Nor do we find there in another of his vers. 32. *τῷ ἀγγέλῳ*. In the same Chapter. vers. 35. we do not read in two of Colbert's, *τοῖς ἀγγέλοις*, nor in several other Manuscripts quoted in the sixth Tome of the Polyglott of England. Robert Stephen has also observed, that this word was only in one of his. *S. Jerom* has not expressed it in his new Edition. Neither did he find it in the ancient Vulgar. In the thirty sixth verse of the same Chapter, we do not read in one of Colbert's, *ἀργύριον*, idle. Beza observed in his Note on that place, that this word was not in one of his Manuscripts.

Chap. 13. vers. 11. instead of *οὐρανῶν*, of Heaven, we read in two of Colbert's, *τοῦ Θεοῦ*, of God. *S. Jerom* observed upon the thirty fifth verse of the same Chapter, a different Reading which is not found in any Greek Copy, nor likewise in any of the ancient Versions. That Learned Critick observes (o) that instead of the word *Prophetam*, that was in the Ancient Vulgar, and which he kept in his New Edition, he read in some Copies *Esaïam Prophetam*. And this made him think, that the ancient Reading of that Passage was *Asaph Prophetam*, because, in truth, the testimony of that Prophet who is there spoken of, is taken out of Psalm 77, which bears * the Name * *Asaph*. He believed, that seeing it was not found in *Esaïa*, that the

(o) Legi in nonnullis codicibus, & studiosus lector fortè reperiet, id ipsum in eo loco ubi nos posuimus, & vulgata habet Editio, ut imperetur quod dictum est per Prophetam dicentem, ibi scriptum, per Esaïam Prophetam dicentem. Quod quia minime inveniebatur in Esaïa, arbitror postea à prudentibus viris esse substitutum: sed mihi videtur in principio ita editum, quod scriptum est per Asaph Prophetam. Hieron. lib. 2. Comm. in Matth. c. 13.

name of this Prophet was taken away. But it is more probable in my Opinion, that the Reading that is in all the *Greek* Copies, and in all the Versions at this day, is the ancient and the true Reading. The Evangelist who cited this Psalm under the name of the Prophet in general, did mean *David*, to whom the Psalms were ordinarily ascribed, without noticing the particular Titles of the Psalms. They might afterwards put the name of *Asaph*, by way of Note in the Margin of this place of *St. Matthew*, and others might change it to that of *Esaÿ*; and this latter Note would pass, as it often happens, into the Copies which *St. Jerom* assures us he did read.

Cod. MS. Colb. n. 4112. In the same Chapter. v. 41. we do not read in one of *Colbert's*, these words, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the Son of Man, nor these others, ἐκ τοῦ βασιλείας αὐτοῦ, out of his Kingdom. Ver. 55. Instead of Ἰωάννης, there is

Cod. MSS. Colb. n. 5149. in two of *Colbert's*, Ἰωάννης, *John*, as in the *Cambridge Copy*, and in another of *Colbert*, Ἰωάν. In the ancient *Vatican Copy* Ἰωάνης, which Reading was followed by the *Vulgar*.

Cod. MS. Colb. n. 4112. Chap. 14. v. 24. We do not read, in one of *Colbert's* τὸ πνεῦμα ἐναντίον, for the wind was contrary. Further, ver. 33. We do not read in another of *Colbert's* ἐλθόντες, being come.

Cod. MS. Colb. n. 3947. Chap. 15. v. 8. These words, τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν, which are cited out of the Prophet *Esaÿ*, and are extant as well in the *Hebrew*, as in the *Greek* of the *Septuagint*, are not in the *Cambridge Copy*, from which they have taken them away as being useless. *St. Jerom*, who did not read them in the ancient *Vulgar*, did likewise omit them in his new Edition. Ver. 31. of the same Chapter, the *Marquess of Veles* did not read in one of his Copies κούρως ὄψεαι, the maimed to be whole, neither are they expressed in *St. Jerom's* Edition, though they are in the *Cambridge Copy*, and in the ancient *Vulgar*. Ver. 36. We do not read in one of *Colbert's*, ἑπτὰ, seven, which might easily have been omitted, especially in the most ancient Copies, where they marked the Numbers by single Letters, as in this place in the *Cambridge Copy*, where there is only the Letter Z'. In the same verse *Beza* observed that these words, καὶ τὰ ἰχθύες, and the fishes, are not in one of his Manuscripts.

Cod. MS. Colb. n. 5149. Chap. 16. v. 2. We read after the word ἄγνωτος, in one of *Colbert's*, this Addition καὶ γίνεται ἕως, καὶ πάλιν, and so it is. Ver. 3. of the same Chapter, the word ἀποκείθω, is not in two of *Colbert's*, nor in the *Cambridge Copy*. *St. Jerom*, who found it not in the ancient *Vulgar*, has not expressed it in his new Edition. In the same verse, we read in one of *Colbert's*, after the word συνέδωκεν, this Addition, καὶ ἀποκρίθεις αὐτῷ, and he answered and said. Ver. 11. of the same Chapter, we read after the word προσέειπεν, in one of *Colbert's*, and in three of *Rob. Stephen's* Manuscripts, προσέειπεν δὲ, but beware.

Cod. Colb. MS. n. 4112.

In

In the same Chap. v. 13. *Beza* did not read in one of his Copies, *ut*. Neither has *St. Jerom* expressed this Pronoun in his new Edition. It also appeared by his Commentary on the place, that he did not believe that we ought to read it. For this is his observation, *Non dixit, quem me dicunt esse homines, sed filium hominis. i. e. He did not say, whom do men say that I am, but — that the Son of Man is.* Nevertheless it was in the ancient Vulgar agreeable to the Cambridge Greek Copy. Ver. 17. where we read *Ἰωάν*, *St. Jerom* does observe, (p) that some believed that it was an error of the Transcribers, and that instead of *bar Jona*, it ought to be *bar Johanna*, the Son of *John*. *Junius* has also put *Ἰωάννα* in the Greek Edition of *Wikel*. But the former Reading is founded on all the ancient and true Copies. The *Jews* of those times had abridged many of their Names. And therefore *bar Jona* was the same thing with *bar Johanna*, and it does not in *St. Matthew* signify the Son of a Dove, as *St. Jerom* did Expound it, but the Son of *John*.

Chap. 17. v. 20. Instead of *ἀπιστία*, *unbelief*, we read in one of *Cod. MS.* *Colbert's* *ἀλιζομίστα* in the same Sense. Which yet seems to be a *Colb. n.* Gloss of some Scholiast, who had a mind to moderate the *ἀπιστία* 5149. by that of *ἀλιζομίστα*, *little faith*. Ver. 23. of the same Chapter, we do not read in one of *Colbert's*, *ἐκλυμήθησαν σφόδρα*, and they were ex- *Cod. MS.* ceeding sorry. *Colb. n.*

Chap. 18. v. 10. We do not read in one of *Colbert's*, *ἐν ἡγανοῖς*, in 5149. Heaven. The 11. ver. of the same Chapter, is not (as *Beza* thinks) *Cod. MS.* in some Greek Copies. But the ancient Greek Fathers did read it, *Colb. n.* and it is also found in all the ancient Versions. *St. Jerom* has not in 2259. his new Edition expressed those words of the 29. v. *eis τὰ πόδια αὐτοῦ*, at his feet, not having read them in the ancient Vulgar. Neither are they in the Cambridge Greek Copy, out of which they were in all likelihood left, as being of no use. *Beza* does assure us, that he found them in all his Manuscripts. In the same verse, *Rob. Stephen* did not read the word *πάντα*, all, in six of his Manuscripts. I found it Transposed after this manner in a *Colbert*, *ἀποδώσουσιν πάντα*. Ver. 35. these words *τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν*, their offences, are not in one of *Colbert's*, nor in the Cambridge Copy. Yet they were added to the Mar- *Cod. Colb.* gin of that of *Colbert*, but the Addition is of a more late Writing, *n. 5149.* than that of the Text. *St. Jerom* has likewise omitted them, having *Cod. MS.* in that followed the ancient Vulgar. Yet *Beza* does assure us, that 2259. he found them in all his Manuscripts. *In omnibus Græcis codicibus hæc* *Beza.* *scripta inveni.* *Annot. in* *Matth. 18.* 35.

(p) *Volunt scriptorum vitio depravatum, ut pro bar Johanna, hæc est, filius Joannis, bar Jona scriptum sit, unâ detractâ syllabâ.* Hieron l. 3. Comm. in Matth. c. 16.

Chap. 19. v. 9. Instead of these words, *μὴ ὅτι πορνεία*, not for fornication, we read in the Cambridge Copy, according to the same Sense, *παρὰ τοὺς λόγους πορνείας*, except it be for fornication. These two Readings are found joyned together in one of Colbert's. But the second Reading is defaced. Ver. 17. of the same Chapter, where we read in the ordinary Greek, *λέγεις ἀγαθόν; ἕτερος ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ ὁ Θεός*. *callest me good, there is none good but one, that is God*, we read in one of Mr. Colbert's, *ἑρως αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ὅς ἐστιν ἀγαθός* which Reading is confirmed by the Cambridge Copy, by that of the Vatican, and by two of Robert Stephen's. St. Jerom has also kept in his Edition the same Reading, which he had found in the ancient Vulgar, but only that he has added the word *Deus*, that had not been there before. In the same Chap. v. 20. these words *ἐκ νεότητός μου*, from my youth are not in one of Colbert's. Neither are they expressed in many ancient Latin Manuscripts. Yet (q) those who were employed at Rome, in the correction of the Vulgar, thought fit to keep them, as Luke of Bruges has observed. Indeed they are in the ancient Vulgar, and in St. Jerom's new Edition.

Cod. MS.
Colb. n.
2259.

Cod. MS.
Colb. n.
2464.

Cod. MS.
Colb. n.
2467.

Chap. 20. v. 7. These words, *καὶ ὃ ἐὰν ᾖ δέχαρον ἀνέλεος*, and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive, are not in the Cambridge Copy, nor in the Marquess of Veles's; but they are found in all other Manuscripts, and in the ancient Oriental Versions. St. Jerom, having not seen them in the ancient Vulgar, did omit them in his new Edition. There are in the same Chapter several other words omitted in the Cambridge Copy, and in the Marquess of Veles's, as well as in the Vulgar, which are yet found in all the other Greek Copies. It is probable, that that Marquess consulted some Copy like to that of Cambridge, with which he agrees pretty often, whilst he differs from all other Copies. It is not strange that St. Jerom's new Edition, and our Vulgar, do in those places agree with the Cambridge Copy, and that of the Marquess of Veles, seeing that Father does himself testify, that when he revised the Vulgar Edition of his time, he did not correct it thoroughly by the Greek Copies, because he was afraid he should offend the Weak, by departing too much from the ancient Edition of the Western Churches.

In the same Chap. 20. v. 22. instead of these words, *μήλω πίνειν καὶ*, there is in three of Rob. Stephen's Copies, *πίνω ἢ*, and in another of Colbert's it is also *ἢ* or, instead of *καὶ* and. This change of the Particle *καὶ*, and, into the disjunctive, *ἢ*, or, is common enough in the

(q) *Romani Patres censuerunt non esse omittendum illud à juventute meâ, tametsi vetusta manuscripta omittant.* Luc. Brug. in loc. insign. Rom. Corr. c. 19. Matth. v. 20.

Greek Manuscripts. In the same verse, these words $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\ \delta\ \epsilon\gamma\omega\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, and be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with, are not in the Cambridge Copy, in two of Rob. Stephen's, in the Marquês of Veles's, nor in one of Mr. Colbert's Manuscripts. Nor has St. Jerom expressed them in his Edition. It is very likely that they were taken out of St. Mark, and inserted in this place of St. Matthew. And therefore we do not read in the same Copies, these other words of the following verse. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\ \delta\ \epsilon\gamma\omega\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\iota\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, and ye shall be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with. Cod. MSS. Colb. n. 2467.

Chap. 21. v. 31. Instead of the word $\alpha\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, first, we read in that of Cambridge, $\epsilon\chi\alpha\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, last, and in the ancient Latin Version annexed to it, *novissimus*: which Reading is also found in some ancient Latin Fathers. St. Jerom, who did likewise read *novissimus* in the Vulgar Edition of his time, rejects this Reading, (r) assuring us, that it was *primum* in the true Copies. Vers. 45. of the same Chapter, instead of $\phi\alpha\pi\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$, Pharisees, there is in a Colbert, and some other Manuscripts, $\tau\epsilon\gamma\upsilon\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$, Scribes.

Chap. 23. The 14. v. of this Chapter is not in the Cambridge Copy, nor in the ancient Latin Version which is joyned to it. The Critics of Louvain have also in the Margin of their Edition, marked ten Latin Manuscripts, where they do not read it. And it seems, that St. Jerom did not put it in his new Edition. For although it be extant in the Text of St. Matthew, which was Printed with his Commentary upon this Evangelist, he does not in that Commentary explain it, where he does nevertheless explain the other verses which concern the Pharisees, no less than the other. Some Commentators on the New Testament have observed, that Origen, and Eusebius did not read it in their Copies. Yet I have found it in a sufficient number of Greek Copies which I have read. But it is Transposed in the most part of these Copies. We read in five of Colbert's, the 14. verse before the 13. Rob. Stephen, has not in his Manuscripts observed upon it any difference of Reading.

Chap. 24. v. 2. $\epsilon\ \beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$. Rob. Stephen did not read the Negative Particle ϵ , not, in six of his Manuscripts, and there is one of Colbert's where it is not. Neither is it extant in the Cambridge Copy, nor has St. Jerom expressed it in his new Edition, because it was not in the ancient Vulgar. Verse 9. of the same Chapter, we do not read in one of Colbert's, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\gamma\omega$, Nations. Beza, (f) who did not

(r) Sciendum est in veris exemplaribus non haberi novissimum, sed primum. Hieron. lib. 3. Comm. in Matth. c. 21.

(f) In uno codice non additur hoc vocabulum, quo etiam sublato, videtur planior esse sententia. Bez. Annot. in Matth. c. 24. v. 9.

read it in one of his Manuscripts, says that the Sense is more entire when it is left out.

In the same Chapter v. 26. after the word *ἡγανῶν*, there is added in the Cambridge Copy, *ἡδὲ υἱός*, nor the Son. Seeing this Addition is found in no other Copy, it is very probable, that it was taken out of St. Luke, where those very words are extant, without any variation. St. Jerom did not think it convenient to put them (τ) in his new Edition, although they were in some Latin Copies of the Vulgar Edition at his time. He further observed, that Origen and Pierius did not read them in their Greek Copies, there having been very few, in which they were extant.

Cod. MSS. Chap. 25. v. 13. These words *ἐν ᾧ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται*, wherein
Colb. n. the Son of Man cometh are not in one of Colbert's, nor in the Cam-
2467. bridge Copy, the Alexandrine, Rob. Stephen's three Manuscripts, and the Marquess of Veles's. Nor has St. Jerom expressed them in his new Edition.

Chap. 26. v. 3. We do not read, *ἡοὶ ἑαυματοῖς*, and the Scribes, in the Cambridge Copy, in the Alexandrine, and in two of Robert Stephen's, nor in some others that are marked in the VI. Tome of the Polyglott of England. St. Jerom has not inserted those words in his Edition. In the same Verse, instead of *οὐαὐαῦ*, we read in one of Colbert, *ἀπὸ* which appears to be an error of the Transcribers.

Cod. MS. In the same Chapter, vers. 11. we do not read in two Colberts,
Colb. n. *πάντοτε γὰρ* for — always. These same words are transposed in
4078. two other Colberts, where we read *τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ πάντοτε*. vers. 24. in-
Cod. MSS. stead of, *παρεδόθη*, is betrayed, the Marquess of Veles has, *παρεδοθήσεται*,
Colb. n. shall be betrayed; which reading is agreeable to St. Jerom's Edition,
4112. and to our Vulgar: Yet we read in the Ancient Cambridge Copy,
4078. *παρεδοθήσεται*.
Cod. MSS. 2467.

In the 26 verse of the same Chapter, instead of *εὐλογήσας*, having
2259. blessed it, we read in five Colberts, *ευχαριστήσας*, having giving thanks;
Cod. MSS. which reading is likewise in seven of Robert Stephen's Manuscripts, in
Colb. n. the Alexandrine, and in some Editions of the New Testament. Fur-
2259. ther, these two words, do not differ in that place, as to the sense,
2467. vers. 28. instead of *ἐκχυνθῶν*, which is shed, we read only in the
4078. Marquess of Veles, *ἐκχυνθούμεν*, which shall be shed, agreeable to St.
4149. Jerom's Edition. Nevertheless Maldonat the Jesuit, did rather choose
to read it with the ordinary Greek, *effunditur*, is shed, in the present,
than with the Vulgar *effundetur*, shall be shed, in the future.

Chap. 27. v. 9. We read in all the Greek Copies, which have been

(τ) In quibusdam Latinis codicibus additum est neque filius, cum in Græcis, & maxime Adamantii & Pierii exemplaribus, hoc non habeatur adscriptum. Sed quia in nonnullis legi, &c. Hieron. lib. 4. Comm. in Matth. c. 24.

known until this day, *Ἰερεμίας*, *Jeremy*. Yet the Passage which St. *Matthew* does quote in that place, is not found in the Prophet *Jeremy*, but in *Zachary*: Which gave an occasion to some Commentators on the New Testament, to believe, that that Evangelist, who had forgot the name of the Prophet whose testimony he brings, had put the one for the other. But others with more likelihood, have imputed this error to the Transcribers, who having found this word contracted after this manner *ΖΠΙΟΤ*, in some Copies, did write *ΙΠΙΟΤ* in its stead. I did read in one Manuscript of Mr. *Colbert's* Library, *Ζαχαρίας* at length: Yet this error is very ancient, seeing it has been observed by *Origen* and by St. *Ferom*. The latter (v) makes mention of an Apocryphal Book attributed to *Jeremy*, that one of the *Nazarene* Sect had lent to him, where the same Passage was extant word for word. And therefore it is possible, that the Ancient *Nazarene* had put the name of the Prophet *Jeremy*, in their *Hebrew* Copy of St. *Matthew*: The *Cambridge* Copy being torn in that place, it cannot be known, if the ordinary reading was there.

Cod. MSS.
Colb. n.
2467.

In the same Chap. ver. 34. instead of *ὄξος*, *vinegar*, we read, in the *Cambridge* Copy, in the Marquess of *Veles's*, in one of *Robert Stephen's* Manuscripts; and in one *Colbert*, *οἶνον*, *wine*; which reading was kept in our *Vulgar*, although *acetum* is extant in St. *Ferom's* Edition. *Beza*, (x) did also believe, that we are to read in the *Greek* *οἶνον*, *wine*, as it is in St. *Mark*. It is not always the surest way to regulate one Evangelist by another: It seems also, that St. *Ferom* was of the Judgment, that the *Greek* Copies, which he believed to be the most correct, ought in that place, to be preferred to the reading of the Ancient *Vulgar*.

Cod. MSS.
Colb. n.
5149.

Ver. 35. of the same Chapter, we do not read in three of Mr. *Colbert's* Manuscripts; these words, *ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ σέφ. φήτε, διμελίσσασθε τὰ ἱμάτια μὲν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ὅτι τὸ ἱματισμὸν μὲν ἔκαλον κλήρον.* That it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by the Prophet, they parted my raiment, and for my vesture they did cast lots. Nor are they found in the *Cambridge* Copy, in the *Alexandrine*, in all *Robert Stephen's*, in an Ancient Manuscript quoted by *Salbert*, nor in some others that are marked in the sixth Tome of the *Polyglott* of Eng-

Cod. MSS.
Colb. n.
5149.
4078.
4112.

(v) Legi nuper in quodam Hebraico volumine, quod *Nazarene* sectæ mihi *Hebraeus* obtulit, *Hieremia* apocryphum, in quo hæc ad verbum scripta reperi. Hieron. lib. 4. Comm. in Matth. c. 27.

(x) Hanc lectionem, quamvis dissentiente Syro interprete, verissimam arbitror, auctore ipso Spiritu Sancto, Marc. 15. 23. Bez. Annot. in Matth. c. 27. v. 34.

Bez. Ann.
in Matth.

land. *Beza*, who found them not in any Ancient Copy, nor in the *Syriack* Version, believed that they were taken out of *St. John*, and inserted in this place of *St. Matthew*: Nevertheless we read these words in our *Vulgar*; and they are likewise put in the Text of *St. Matthew*, which was Printed with *St. Jerom's* Commentary. But if we examin the manner how he does express himself in that Commentary, we shall easily judge, that he has not added them, in his Edition. Indeed the Divines of *Louvain* have marked 15 Latin Manuscripts in the Margin of their Edition of the New Testament, where they did not read them.

In the same Chapter, v. 49. this verse is not in a Manuscript cited in the sixth Tome of the Polyglott of *England*: At the end of the same verse, after the word *αὐτῶν*, *Rob. Stephen*, did, in two of his Manuscripts, read this Addition, *Ἄλλο δὲ λαβὼν λόφῳ ἐνέειπε αὐτῷ τῷ πλάγῳ, καὶ ἐξήλασεν ἰδοὺ καὶ αἷμα.* But another taking a Spear pierced his Side, and there came forth blood and water. *Luke of Bruges* does observe, that these words are not *St. Matthew's*, but that they were taken out of *St. John*, Chap. 19. v. 34. In the 64 verse of the same Chapter, we do not read, *νυκτὸς*, by night, in three of *Colbert's*, in the *Cambridge* Copy, in the *Alexandrine*, in two of *Rob. Stephen's* Manuscripts, nor in the Marquess of *Veles's*. Neither has *St. Jerom* expressed these words in his new Edition.

Chap. 28. v. 2. we do not read these words *ἀπὸ θύρας*, from the door, in the *Cambridge* Copy, nor in the Marquess of *Veles's*. *St. Jerom*, seeing he found them not in the Ancient *Vulgar*, has not put them in his new Edition; but they are extant in all the other Manuscripts. We do likewise read, (after the word *θύρας*, in two *Colbert's* and many other Manuscripts, which are marked in the sixth Tome of the Polyglott of *England*) *τὸ μνημεῖον*, the Sepulcher, ver. 7. of the same Chap. we do not read in the *Cambridge* Copy, nor in the Marquess of *Veles*, these words *ἀπὸ τοῦ νεκρῶν*, from the dead, whence they were in all probability taken away as superfluous. Neither has *St. Jerome* expressed them in his Edition: But they are extant in all other *Greek* Copies.

It would be to no purpose to run through the other Books of the New Testament, for marking the various readings thereof, or at least the Principal amongst them. Those we have already produced are sufficient to shew, that they were not exempted from such changes as length of time, and the errors of Transcribers do bring

Cod. MS.
Colb. n.
2467.
4078.

(γ) Totum hoc membrum cum Prophetæ testimonio in nullis vetustis codicibus reperimus, neque legitur in Syra interpretatione. Adjectum proculdubio ex Joann. 19. 24. Bez. ibid. v. 35.

into

into Books. I have in this Collection rather kept to the Manuscripts of Monsieur *Colbert's* Library, than to the King's, because, as I suppose, there have been none of the former as yet published. I shall handle more at large those different Readings of the Copies of the New Testament, in the Second Part of this Work, where I shall particularly examine our *Latin* Edition, and the ancient Versions of the Oriental Churches, by comparing them with the *Greek* Copies, whence they were taken. I have likewise beforehand, spoken somewhat of the Method which *S. Jerom* took in reforming the Ancient Vulgar by the best *Greek* Copies of his time.

CHAP. XXXIII.

Of the Order of the Greek Manuscript Copies of the New Testament. The Verses, Chapters and other Marks of Distinction of those Copies. The Canons which Eusebius added to the Gospels, and the Use of those Canons.

THE most ancient *Greek* Copies of the New Testament are written without any distinction, not only of Chapters and Verses, but also of Words; so that we may apply to those Copies that which was said elsewhere of the Books of the Old Testament, that they only make one *Pasuk* or Verse from their several beginnings. They did not then know what it was to mark with Points, Comma's and other Distinctions, which have been afterwards inserted in Books to make the reading more easie and distinct. We shall further observe, that even since Distinctions of this nature have been in use, the most part of Transcribers did neglect them, as well as the Accents in the ancient *Greek* Manuscripts. And therefore it is very rare to find such Marks of Distinction in the *Greek* Copies for above these thousand years past. The Copy of *S. Paul's* Epistles which is in the Royal Library, and that of the *Benedictins* of the Abbey of *S. Germain* are also written without any distinction of Points and other Stops; and altho the Words are accented there, it seems, that the Accents were added in the King's Copy, seeing they are not of the same Hand with the Body of the Book. This does not hinder but that Accents and Points or Marks of Distinction are much more ancient than these

two Manuscripts. But the Transcribers did commonly neglect them. There were none but very curious and very exact persons who took care to add them to their Copies.

Georgius Syncellus (a) makes mention of a Greek Copy of the Bible that was written before this great Accuracy, where the Accents and Points were placed. He says, that that Copy was brought to him from the Library of *Cesarea in Cappadocia*, and that he perceived by the Inscription of the Book, that it had been transcribed from an ancient Copy which had been corrected by the great *S. Basil*. There are also Manuscript Hebrew Copies which have been copied by the *Jews*. It is very rare to find the Points, Vowels and the Accents to have been noted therein for five or six hundred years past. This only happens in the most exact Books: yet there are some Works extant above four hundred years, where there is mention made of those Points and Accents which were in use at that time in their Copies.

The most ancient Church Writers do likewise in their Works speak of all those Marks of Distinction which are at present in the Greek Copies of the New Testament. We read there of the word *σεκλιον*, *Section*, and *κεφαλαιον*, *Chapter*. They sometimes observe the places where the Points ought to be marked to remove the ambiguity of a Discourse, especially when the Hereticks do observe a different Punctuation. But after all, it must be avowed, that there has been nothing determined to the purpose upon this matter. Every one did most commonly, according to his prejudices, mark that sort of Distinctions, which depended on the Transcribers and the Expositors of the Scripture. And therefore *Petavius* after having observed what *S. Epiphanius* and some other ancient Doctors of the Church have brought against some Hereticks about the manner of pointing the third Verse of the first Chapter of the Gospel according to *S. John*, does add, (b) that that diversity of pointing those words of *S. John*, ought not to be attributed to the ill design of those who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, or to other Hereticks, but only to the different Opinions of the Transcribers and Interpreters.

(a) 'Εν ἐνὶ τῇ ἀντιγράφῳ λίαν ἀκρίβειαν ἔχει τε σημειώματα καὶ σεκλιῶν ἐν τῇ ἐν Καυσαρίᾳ τῇ Καππαδοκίᾳ ἐλθόντι εἰς ἐμὴν βιβλιοθήκην ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐπιγράφεται, ὡς ὁ μέγας καὶ δεινὸς βασιλεὺς τὰς εἰς αὐτὸ αὐτῶν ἀντιγράφων ἀντιγράφων διωκτῶσαν βιβλίαν, &c. *Georg. Syncel. Chronol. p. 203.*

(b) *Existimo varietatem illam interpretationis ex librariorum aut interpretum diversâ sententiâ profectam esse, non ex fraude ulla Pneumatomachorum, vel aliorum hereticorum.* *Petav. Theol. Dog. lib. 2. c. 6. n. 6.*

The truth is, the Orthodox Authors do not always agree amongst themselves about it. It happens sometimes, that the same Writer does differently point the same Passage in different places of his Works. And so there is nothing else but good Sense and the Rules of Criticism that can direct us in our choice, in preferring one Punctuation to another. I know we ought to follow the plurality of good Manuscript Copies, and the consent of Interpreters. For example, without taking notice of all that S. *Augustine* has observed upon the manner of pointing the third Verse of the first Chapter of the Gospel according to S. *John*, we may read that Verse after this manner *γενεσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ ἵππῳ*, without him was not any thing made that was made. This reading, which is almost in all Manuscripts, has been approved by the most Ancient Greek Fathers. The other, which does place a point after the word *ἐν*, is somewhat forced, and according to this punctuation, it ought to be translated, *Without him nothing was made, that which was made had life in him*. It is worth the while to observe, that many Greek Manuscript Copies, have a point after the word *ἐν*, but that point answers to our comma, in those Manuscripts, which have two sorts of points, the one truly answering to our point, and the other to that we call a comma.

Yet St. *Augustine* does frequently maintain the distinction, that places the point after the word *nihil*: He further maintains, that this Passage is pointed after this manner in the most correct Copies. *Quod factum est, in illo vita erat, that which was made, in him was life*; so that there is not only a point to be placed after *nihil*, but also a comma after these other words, *quod factum est*. Sic ergo, (saith this Father) *distinguendum est, ut cum dixerimus, quod factum est, deinde inferamus, in illo vita est, non in se scilicet, hoc est in sua natura*. (d) He condemns those who placed a comma after the Pronoun *illo*, and who favoured their own prejudices by this punctuation. But there appears commonly more subtilty than solidity, in Reasonings of this sort. For seeing every one does reason from certain Principles, which he supposes to be true, he points the Copies of the Scripture after his own fashion. Those disputes had so divided the Minds of the Ancients of that time, that there were four different ways of

(c) Nec pratermittendum est quod emendatiorez codices habent, quod factum est, in illo vita est. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. lib. 5. c. 14.

(d) Non ergo pronunciari oportet, quod factum est in illo, vita est, ut subdistinguamus, quod factum est in illo, & deinde inferamus, vita est. Quid enim non in illo factum est? Aug. ibid. c. 13.

pointing this Passage of St. *John*, whereas, at this day there is no dispute about it.

This does inform us, that although the most part of Transcribers, did then neglect the points and the other marks of distinction; yet they were put for all that in some Copies. The Commentators on the Scripture observed them likewise in their Commentaries, when they judged it fit: But seeing they had not the first Original of the Evangelists and the Apostles, where those marks of distinction were extant, there is nothing certain in this matter: We ought also to use precaution in reading the Writings of the Fathers, especially when they dispute against the Hereticks of their time; from whom they removed in their Opinions, as far as it was possible for them. Now, it is not necessary to insist too nicely on this sort of distinctions, and stops; there commonly needs but a little of good sense, to make a due estimate of them. There is none for example, but will condemn some of the Moderns, for the innovations they have made in our Age; who in favour of their own prejudicate Opinions, read, Chap. 23. of St. *Luke*, v. 43. λέγω σοι σήμερον, καὶ ἐμὲ ἔσθι ἐν παραδείσῳ. *I say unto thee, to day thou shalt be with me in Paradise.* They place a comma after the word σήμερον, *day*, whereas, according to the ordinary Reading of the Greek Copies, whether Manuscript or Printed, it ought to be placed after the Pronoun σοι, *thee*: Which gives a very different sense, viz. *I say unto thee, to day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.*

Besides those marks of distinction of which we have been speaking, there is another which is common to all the ancient Books, and which is made by the means of Verses. The Bulk of a Work did once appear, if the number of Verses contained therein were summ'd up at the end: A Verse was nothing else, but a Line that the Greeks called σίχθ, so that, by numbering the Verses, they discovered how many Lines were contained in any Volume. Yet some Criticks could not comprehend how they could, by those Lines or Verses, reckon the just content of a Book, because the Parchments, upon which they writ, having been unequal, the Lines must needs have been so too; and so the number of those Lines could not adjust the Bulk of a Work. This was that which *Crojus* brought against *Causabon*; and withal he confirm'd his Opinion by the testimony of some Ancient Writers, by whom he pretended to prove, that the word σίχθ does signify an entire Period, or the several parts of Periods.

But this Objection does fall by it self, if we make a just reflection on those Ancient Parchments, which composed Volumes or Rolls. Every Roll contained many Pages that were all equal, and in every

Page there was a certain number of Lines; and lastly, in every Line, there was a fixed number of Letters. And this is observed by the *Jews* at this day, in their Rolls, which must have a certain proportion, as well in length as in breadth: Moreover every Line ought to consist of thirty Letters; and they called these Letters *sitta*, which is the same thing with the *σξ* of the *Greeks*, and the *versus* of the *Latins*. We are not to imagine, that the manner in which the *Rabbins* have divided the Bible, is of their own invention: They followed in that the practice of other Nations, as I have proved elsewhere. And seeing they have retained their ancient use of Rolls, we must learn of them, whatever belongs to the division of the Rolls or Ancient Volumes.

Further, it is not hard to shew, how the measure of the Lines or Verses might have been retained in the form of those ordinary Books, in which the Parchments or Papers were unequal. For when the breadth of the paper could not contain a whole Line, they placed the rest of the Letters or Words above the Line. It seems they designed in this manner, to write by way of Verses, the Ancient *Greek* and *Latin* Copy of St. Paul's Epistles, which is in the Royal Library, and that of the *Benedictine* Monks of the Abbey of St. *Germain*. Or rather, they who copied these two Manuscripts by others that were more Ancient, did not at all understand the nature of the ancient Lines or Verses; and therefore they did not altogether imitate the same. However it be, it is certain that there is nothing more ordinary amongst the ancient Writers, than to mark at the end of their Books, the number of Verses which they contained.

I do not deny, but that there is another sort of Verses which were regulated according to the sense, or the sentences, in the same manner as they are represented in our Books. In this we have imitated the *Jews*, who divided their Bible into this kind of Verses. This latter sort has an original quite different from that of the former: For seeing they did read the Scripture in their Synagogues and in their Schools, they made this new division of Verses for the convenience of their Lessons. We also see something of the like nature in some *Greek* Manuscript Copies of the New Testament, and in some Manuscript Church Bibles: I have not only observed the beginning and the ending of the Lessons, which they called *ἀναγνώματα*, which are as so many different Chapters, but also certain marks in form of a cross in all the places where the sentences do end, and where the Reader makes a little stop, according to the custom of the *Greek* Churches. This we may call a Verse or Sentence, and which the *Greeks* do signify by the word *ῥήματα*.

Jo. Croj.
ibid.

Crojus is mistaken, when he would persuade us, that the *Greeks* did at the end of their Gospels, mark the number of the words, as well as that of the Verses that were contained therein. For the examples which he does produce after *Salmusius*, ought to be understood of Sentences and not of Words, as may be proved by those very words which he brings, as taken out of a Manuscript Copy, that assigns to St. *Matthew*, *ῥήματα βραβ'* (2522) *στίχες βραβ'* (2560) to St. *Mark*, *ῥήματα αρε'* (1675) *στίχες αρε'* (1616) If the Greek word *ῥήματα* is taken in this place for the words, as *Crojus* expounds it, what proportion can there be betwixt the Words and the Verses, seeing they reckoned almost the same number of Words as Verses in those two Gospels, viz. in St. *Matthew*, 2522 words, and 2560 Verses; in St. *Mark*, 1675 words, and 1616 Verses? We must therefore understand the number of Sentences to be signified by the word *ῥήματα*, and the ancient Verses which were measured according to the Lines, or some other sort of Verses to be meant by the word *στίχοι*.

We find the Number of the Verses of each Book, at the end of several Greek Manuscript Copies of the New Testament. *Robert Stephen* does sometimes mark them in his fair Greek Edition, and it would be easy to note them all. But this in my Opinion would be of little use; besides that the Manuscripts wherein I have observed them, are not very ancient, and they do not agree amongst themselves about the matter. *Scaliger* caused to be Printed, at the end of the Chronology of the Patriarch *Nicephorus*, a *Stichometrie* or the number of the Verses of all the Books of the Bible, under that Patriarch's Name: Mr. *Pitbon* before him, had published that *Stichometrie* under the same Name. But it is more ancient, and we find that it is inserted in the Works of some other Greek Historians: They were also placed, as has been already observed, at the end of two Greek and Latin Copies of St. *Paul's* Epistles, of which we have already spoken. I shall here take notice of what belongs to the Verses of the New Testament, and seeing that there is somewhat singular in that Catalogue, I shall change nothing, either as to the order of the Books, or the manner.

(c) St. *Matthew*, according to that Ancient Catalogue that is written in Latin, does contain 2600 Verses. St. *John*, 2000. St. *Mark*,

(c) *Matthæus* ver. IIDC. *Joannes* ver. II. *Marcus* ver. IDC. *Lucas* IIDCCCC. *Epistole Pauli ad Romanos* ver. IXL. *ad Corinthios 1.* ver. ILX. *ad Corinthios 2.* LXX. *ad Galatas* ver. CCCL. *ad Ephesios* ver. CCCLXXV. *ad Timotheum 1.* ver. CCVIII. *ad Timotheum 2.* ver. CCLXXXVHI. *ad Titum* ver. CXL. *ad Colossenses* ver. CCL. *ad Filemonem* ver. L. *ad Petrum 1.* ver. CC. *ad Petrum 2.* ver. 1600.

1600. St. Luke, 2900. The Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans, 1040. The first to the Corinthians, 1060. the second to the Corinthians, 70. (there is an error in this place) The Epistle to the Galatians, 350. the Epistle to the Ephesians, 375. the first to Timothy, 208. the second to Timothy, 288. the Epistle to Titus, 140. to the Colossians, 251. to Philemon, 50. the first of St. Peter, 200. the second of the same Apostle, 140. that of St. James, 220. the first of St. John, 220. the second, 20. and also the third, 20. the Epistle of St. Jude, 60. that of St. Barnabas, 850. the Revelation of St. John, 1200. the Acts of the Apostles, 2600. the Book of the pastor, 4000. the Acts of St. Paul, 4560. the Revelation of Peter, 270.

Casaubon, who was well versed in Greek Authors, preferred the ancient division that is found in the Manuscripts, to that which has been invented in these latter times, and which appears in our Printed Bibles. He does also wish that some able Critick would restore it: He speaks of that which is made by way of Titles and Chapters. They called, (as he affirms) the great Sections, *τίτλος*, titles, and the small, *κεφάλαια*, chapters: He might have added, that the word *κεφάλαιον* Chapter, is also sometimes taken for the great Sections, and that then, it does not differ from that which the Greeks call *τίτλος* Title.

Casaub.
Not. in
Nov. Test.

There is nothing more ordinary amongst the Ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, than the word *κεφάλαιον*, Chapter, for the Greeks, and that of *Capitulum* for the Latins, when they quote the Sacred Books. It would not be hard to re-establish that ancient division by the help of Manuscripts; but I shall content my self to mention here what belongs to the New Testament. We read in one of the Manuscripts of the Royal Library, that St. Matthew contains 68 Titles, and 355 Chapters. St. Mark, 48 Titles, and 234 Chapters; St. Luke 83 Titles, and 342 Chapters; St. John 18 Titles, and 231 Chapters. Which agrees with the Observation of Suidas, upon the word *τίτλος*, unless we must in that Author, instead of *α'*. 36. read *α'*. 236. as it is in some Manuscripts, and in the Greek Edition in folio of Robert Stephen's New Testament.

Suidas.

CXL. Jacobi ver. CCXX. prima Joannis Epistola ver. CCXX. Joannis Epistola 2. ver. XX. Joannis Epistola 3. ver. XX. Jude Epistola ver. LX. Barnabe Epistola ver. DCCCL. Joannis Revelatio ver. ICC. Actus Apostolorum ver. IIDC. Pastoris ver. IIII. Actus Pauli IIIDLX. Revelatio Petri CCLXX. Codd. MSS. Bibl. Reg. & Bened. S. Germ.

(f) Τὸ καὶ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον ἔχει τίτλους ξη', καὶ κεφάλαια ττ'· τὸ καὶ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον ἔχει τίτλους μη', κεφάλαια σδ'· τὸ καὶ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγέλιον ἔχει τίτλους πγ', κεφάλαια τμζ'· τὸ καὶ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγέλιον ἔχει τίτλους ιθ', κεφάλαια σνα'. Cod. MS. Biblioth. Reg. n. 2861.

More-

Moreover we read at the beginning of the same Manuscript of the Royal Library, that there is in St. *Matthew*, ξ'. 68 Chapters; so as they call that a Chapter in that place, which is called a Title in the end of the Book; and there is the same thing observable in the other three Gospels. By which we may know, that the word Chapter is taken two ways, and that it is applyed as well to the great as to the small Sections. When they prefix the numbers of the κεφάλαια or Chapters to the Books, this word does then signifie great Sections; and in this manner they are marked at the beginning of the most part of the *Greek Manuscript Copies* of the New Testament, in the first Editions of *Erasmus*, in that of *Robert Stephen in folio*, and in some others. This is instead of a Table or Index of the Contents, which at once, does represent the Principal things in a Work. In this manner the most exact *Greek Transcribers*, do mark the Summaries, (under the title of κεφάλαια, Chapters) at the beginning of their Copies: And seeing they have likewise noted them, in the Margin of their Copies, or at the top or the bottom of the Pages, in all the places where those Chapters begin, they have for this reason given them the name of τίτλοι, titles. There is then no difference betwixt Title and Chapter, according to this sense; unless it be, that the Chapters are marked at the beginning of the Books, and the Titles in the Margin. This I observed, in comparing several Manuscript *Greek Copies* of the New Testament, one with the other.

The word κεφάλαιον does, on the contrary, signifie the small Sections that are marked in the Margins of the *Greek Manuscript Copies* of the New Testament by Letters instead of Numbers. *Erasmus* did also put them in his first Editions of the New Testament, in which he was followed by *Robert Stephen*, in his Edition in *Folio*, who has likewise subjoyned them separately at the end of S. *Mark*, where he reckons σλς' 236 κεφάλαια Chapters, and at the end of S. *Luke*, where he computes τμβ' 342. whereas in the King's Manuscript, which I quoted; S. *Mark* does only contain σλς' 234 Chapters. The truth is, the *Greek Copies* do not agree amongst themselves about the thing, especially in the Gospel of S. *Mark*. We have already shewn, that several *Greek Churches* did not once read the twelve last Verses of this Gospel, which begin with these words, ἀναστῆς ὁ κύριος, &c. and so they might have had fewer small Sections in their Copies, than what are ordinarily reckoned. Nevertheless, there are some Manuscripts where the Section 234 is last marked, over against these words, ἀναστῆς ὁ κύριος, &c. there being no other that answers to the rest of the Text. Moreover, it is certain, that the Churches, where these Copies were in use, did read those twelve Verses, for they have inserted in

in that place, the word τέλος, *end*, and ἀρχή, *beginning*, to note, that they began another Lesson there: Yet we have no sure foundation here, to build any certainty upon, because the Observations of that sort have been taken from the *Synaxarion* or the Church Bibles of the Greeks. And so they regulated these distinctions by the *Lectionaries* which were then read in the Churches, to accommodate the Copies of the New Testament to the custom that obtained amongst them.

The Churches which did not read the twelve last Verses of S. Mark, *Cod. MS. do only reckon in that Gospel σλγ'. 233. small Sections, as it ap- Bibl. Reg. n. 2861.* pears by an ancient Manuscript of the Royal Library. There is another Copy less ancient than that in the same Library, which does *Cod. MS. likewise only represent 233. and the last small Section answers to Bibl. Reg. n. 2856.* these Words, εἰς ἑξαβήτους, &c. to which *Rob. Stephen*, in his Edition, made the Section 233. to answer. The Churches which did read those twelve Verses reckon more than 233. Sections; but they agree not amongst themselves: for some have comprehended all those Verses under one Section, and in their Copies there are only 234 Sections extant: others, on the contrary, have divided them into many small Sections: and therefore *Rob. Stephen* has mark'd after some Manuscripts σλς' 236. I have also seen a Manuscript Copy where there were σμα' 241. *Cod. MS. Bibl. Reg. n. 2859.*

Further, this division of the Sacred Books is very ancient; for *Justin Martyr* makes mention of these small Sections under the name of *σεικοπι*. *Eusebius* (in his Letter to *Carpianus*, which was printed with the ten Canons which he so ingeniously invented, (for shewing at once that wherein the Evangelists did agree, and that which is peculiar to each of them) does use indifferently these Words, *σεικοπι* Section, and *κεφάλαιον* Chapter. *Denis of Alexandria* speaking of certain Authors who rejected the Revelation of S. John, says, that they had examined all the Chapters, καὶ ἕκαστον κεφάλαιον *Dionys. Alex. apud Euf. Hist. Eccl. i. 7. c. 25.* In a word, There are few of the ancient Greek Writers where the word *κεφάλαιον* Chapter, is not found in the sense that we have observed.

Eusebius is not then the Author of those small Sections, but he made a very profitable use of them in the ten Canons that he invented, and which St. *Jerom* applied to the *Latin* Copies of the four Gospels, in the same manner as he had seen them applied to the *Greek* Copies. Those who cannot consult the Manuscript Copies for this, ought to read the first *Greek* Editions of the New Testament that were published by *Erasmus*, or that were done by *Rob. Stephen*, which is in *folio*. Those ten Canons are rank'd before the Gospel under ten separate Titles, and the Application there-

of

of is marked in the Margin of every Gospel. The small Sections are there noted by Letters instead of Numbers, according to the custom of the *Greeks*.

The Canons to which those Sections do answer are marked by other Letters which do not exceed the number of Tën, which is the number of those Canons. The Letters last mentioned ought to be read according to the method used by *Eusebius*, for distinguishing them the more easily from the others: but *Rob. Stephen* has distinguished them by a small Stroke which is set over those which mark the small Sections. All this was also observed in the *Latin* Editions of the New Testament with great exactness. It is not necessary that I should here produce Manuscript Copies; it is enough to consult the first Impressions of our *Latin* Bibles. Those ten Canons of *Eusebius*, with the small Sections, are found as well at the beginning of the Gospels as in the Margins of every Gospel in particular, in the same manner as in the *Greek* Copies. The Sections are marked by our common Figures 1, 2, 3, &c. and the Canons by the *Roman* Figures I. II. III. &c.

It was hard for the *Greek* Transcribers who writ the Canons of *Eusebius* to commit no fault, by putting some Letters for others. Indeed in comparing several Manuscript Copies of those Canons, I found some difference amongst them; which nevertheless is easily helped, unless it be in the places where the Copies do not agree about the number of Sections. If we consult, for Example, the ten Canons, as they are in *Rob. Stephen's* Edition, and the most part of the Manuscripts, 'tis manifest that the twelve last Verses of *St. Mark* were in the *Greek* Copies in the time of *Eusebius*. For he marks, in the tenth Canon, the Section $\alpha\lambda\epsilon'$ 234. of that Evangelist, and in the eighth the Section $\alpha\lambda\epsilon'$ 235: which are included in those twelve Verses.

Nevertheless, it might have been so, that those two Sections were afterwards added to the Canons of *Eusebius* by those who read those twelve Verses of *St. Mark* in their Churches: and so those Canons could not be a certain Rule in that place, if it were not known, upon some other ground, that those Verses were extant in *S. Mark* before *Eusebius*. *Marianus Victorius*, who caus'd to be printed with *St. Jerom's* Works those ten Canons of *Eusebius* at the beginning of that Father's Commentaries upon *St. Matthew*, does, in the *English* Canon, mark the 234 Section of *St. Mark*, and in the tenth, the 235 Section; yet he does only mark 233 Sections in the Margin of that Evangelist: and it is worth the Observation, that the 233 Section, which is the last, does answer to these words, *at illæ exem- ies*, &c. chap. 16. v. 8. as if all the rest that followed of that Gospel did

did not truly belong to St. *Mark*. This was insinuated by S. *Jerom* in his Letter to *Hedibia*, where he says, that the most part of the Greek Copies had not this last Chapter, *Omnibus Græciæ libris penè hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus*. By this Word *Capitulum* he understood the twelve last verses; whether it be that that Chapter does only contain a small Section, as in truth there is but one marked in some Manuscripts, or that according to other Manuscripts it does include many. However it be, it does not appear that *Marianus* did observe an Uniformity in this matter: for he does produce a greater number of Sections of St. *Mark* in the eighth and in the ninth Canon of *Eusebius*, than he has noted in the Margin of that Apostle. *Basle's* Edition of St. *Jerom's* Works is more exact upon this matter; for there is an equal number of Sections, viz. 235. marked in both those places therein.

*Hieron.
Epist. ad
Hedib.
qu. 3.*

*Apud
Frob. ann.
1526.*

It would be to no purpose to speak of the Chapters and Sections of the *Acts of the Apostles*, and of the Epistles of St. *Paul*, because they may be seen in the Commentaries that have been printed under the Name of *Oecumenius*. I will only in this place add another sort of Division, called *ἀναγνώματα*, *Lessons*. This distinction of the whole New Testament into several Lessons is very ancient, and they are also mark'd in the *Cambridge* Copy. Although these Lessons are not much different from Chapters; if the Word Chapter be taken for Title, or a great Section, yet we are not to confound these two, as some Authors have done. There are fewer Lessons than Titles or great Sections, as I observed in the reading some Copies where these Lessons are mark'd exactly; and there are also some in which the Word *τὸ τέλος* the end, and *ἀρχὴ* the beginning, are inserted, to denote the end of one Lesson and the beginning of another, which was taken from the Greek Church Bibles: and therefore we find in the Margins of those Manuscript Copies, not only the Summaries of Sections, called Titles or Chapters, but also the days on which those *ἀναγνώματα* Lessons were to be read in the Churches. The Greek *Amanuenses* have drawn Observations of this nature from their Church Bibles, and of them they composed a Table called *Synaxarion*, which they placed at the Beginning or the End of their Books. Seeing this does rather belong to the usage of the Greek Churches than to the cognisance of a Critick who treats of the Greek Copies of the New Testament, I shall insist on it no longer: nevertheless, it is worthy of our Observation, that that distinction of different Lessons, relating to the reading in the Church, has occasioned some small Alterations in some Greek Copies. They have taken away, for example, in certain places, *ἔνι* but, *ὑπὲρ* for, *ἐν* therefore, and some other the like Particles, whenever they happened to

A a

be

be at the beginning of a Lesson. They have also changed some Relative Pronouns into proper Names. It was also sometimes necessary, not to leave the Sense imperfect, to put proper Names at the beginning of their Lessons, and the Transcribers have inserted them in their Copies. And therefore caution is necessary; otherwise we shall multiply various Readings of the New Testament without any necessity. When that happens, we need only consult the *Greek Church Bibles* that are used in the *Greek Churches*, to observe in what places they begin their new Lessons.

FINIS.

The TRANSLATOR'S
POSTSCRIPT
TO THE
READER.

THE former Works of the Learned Author have been well accepted by the public, and 'tis hoped this may be no less.

The Art of Critic, tho by common mistake, subjected to the slavish Drudgery of words under the tyranny of the Pedants, is notwithstanding of great use throu the universal course of good Learning, and an excellent Assistant to the Arts and Sciences, even those of the highest Rank, as Theology, Laws, and Medicine.

This Art the admirable Industry of our Author hath so applied to Theology, as to render the most hard, dry, and unpleasant Subjects, no less delightful than profitable, he having conversed with so many Books and Languages, as seems almost impossible for one Man.

'Tis not to be wondered that he has committed Mistakes, having had the Misfortune to be brought up in the *Church of Rome*, which uses the Holy Scriptures chiefly in order to corrupt them; equalling, if not preferring Traditions to them, founding its Infallibility on its self, being supported by the intricate Juggles of the *Canonists*, and the Gibberish of the *Schoolmen*.

However, if his Alloy be disliked, this Advantage may be expected, That the Learned of our Church, which pays a due respect to the Scriptures and uncorrupted Antiquity, and is accomplished with all kinds of Learning requisite, will be hereby excited to refine on the Subject.

CONTENTS

Of the First Part.

Chap. I. **T**HE Verity of the New Testament defended in general against the ancient Hereticks. Reflections upon the Principle made use of by the Fathers to establish the Authority of these Books. Page 1.

Chap. II. Concerning the Titles that are at the Head of the Gospels and other Books of the New Testament: whether these Titles were made by the Authors of these Books, or whether they were since added? pag. 12.

Chap. III. Concerning Books that have been published under the Name of Jesus Christ and the Apostles. Of several other Acts forged by the ancient Hereticks. Reflections on the whole matter. pag. 19.

Chap. IV. The ancient Fathers have not produced the Originals of the New Testament in their Disputes against the Hereticks. An Examination of Proofs that are brought to shew that these Originals have been kept in some Churches. pag. 30.

Chap. V. Of the Books of the New Testament in particular; and first of the Gospel of St. Matthew. The Original of this Gospel hath been written in the Hebrew Tongue

The Contents.

*Tongue which the Jews of Jerusalem spake at that time.
An Answer to the Reasons that are contrary to this
Opinion.* pag. 39.

Chap. VI. *The Jews of the Territory of Jerusalem at the
time of Jesus Christ and the Apostles spake in the Chal-
daick or Syriack Tongue. An Answer to the Reasons
that Mr. Vossius hath published against this Opinion.
At the same time several Difficulties are cleared apper-
taining to this matter.* pag. 46.

Chap. VII. *Of the Sect of the Nazarenes, and of their
Hebrew or Chaldaick Copy of the Gospel of St. Mat-
thew.* pag. 51.

Chap. VIII. *Of the Ebionites. Of their Copy of the Go-
spel of St. Matthew. Of some other ancient Hereticks
who have made use of this same Gospel.* pag. 72.

Chap. IX. *Of the Greek Copy of St. Matthew, and its
Authority. A Comparison of this Copy with the Hebrew
or Chaldaick. An Answer to the Objections of some
Hereticks against this Gospel.* pag. 98.

Chap. X. *Of the Time and Order of every Gospel. Some
Greek Manuscript Copies are produced thereupon. Of
S. Mark and his Gospel, which is commonly believed to be
the second. Of his Office of Interpreter to S. Peter.* pag. 83.

Chap. XI. *In what Language S. Mark hath written his
Gospel. Of the twelve last Verses of this Gospel, which are
not*

The Contents.

not found in several Greek Manuscript Copies. pag. 91.

Chap. XII. Of the Gospel of S. Luke; what hath obliged him to publish it, since there were two others that had been written before his. Of Marcion, and his Copy of S. Luke's Gospel. The Catholics have also altered this Gospel in some places. pag. 101.

Chap. XIII. Of the Gospel of S. John; and of Hereticks that have rejected this Gospel. Their Reasons with an Answer to them. An Inquiry concerning the twelve Verses of this Gospel which are not found in some ancient Copies. Several Greek Manuscript Copies are cited to clear this Difficulty. Some Criticks have imagined without any grounds that the last Chapter of this Gospel did not belong to S. John. pag. 113.

Chap. XIV. Of the Acts of the Apostles that have been received in the Church. Other Acts of the Apostles that have been forged. pag. 126.

Chap. XV. Of the Epistles of S. Paul in general. Of Marcion, and his Copy of these Epistles. False Letters attributed to S. Paul. pag. 131.

Chap. XVI. Of the Epistle to the Hebrews in particular. Whether it be S. Paul's, and Canonical. What Antiquity hath believed thereupon, as well in the Eastern as in the Western Countries. The Opinions of these later Ages concerning this Epistle. pag. 142.
Chap.

The Contents.

Chap. XVII. *Of the Catholick or Canonical Epistles in general, and in particular.*
pag. 154.

The Contents of the Second Part.

Chap. XVIII. **A** *Critical Observation on a Passage in S. John's First Epistle, Chap. v. ver. 7. which is wanting in the most Greek Copies, Eastern Editions, and the most ancient Latin Copies. The Preface to the Canonical Epistles in some Latin Bibles, under the name of S. Jerom, was not penn'd by that Father. It cannot be proved that S. Cyprian had the Passage of S. John's Epistle in his Copy.*
Page. 1.

Chap. XIX. *Of the Book of the Revelation. What was the Belief of the Ancients concerning it. The Hereticks that did reject it. Their Reasons; which are Examined. There have been also Learned Catholicks of ancient time, who have ascribed it to Cerinthus. The Opinion of these latter times about the same Book.*
pag. 14.

Chap. XX. *The Objections of the Jews, and other Enemies of the Christian Religion, against the Books of the New Testament. Inquiry is made if the Evangelists and Apostles made use of the Greek Version of the Septuagint, in the Passages which they quote out of the Old Testament. St. Jerom's Opinion upon the matter. That Father declared himself for the Hebrew Text of the Jews, in opposition to that of the Septuagint.*
pag. 25.
Chap.

The Contents.

Chap. XXI. *A Discussion of some other Objections against the Books of the New Testament. The Evangelists and Apostles (in the manner of their explaining the Passages of the Old Testament, and applying them to the Messiah) followed the Custom which then obtained amongst the Jews. There are many Words in the New Testament which have a larger signification than they have in the Old; and that can be attributed to nothing but to that usage, and to a Tradition received amongst the Jews.*

pag. 36.

Chap. XXII. *A particular Examination of many Passages of the Old Testament, cited by the Apostles in a sense that seems to be altogether foreign. Some Difficulties formed against their Writings are cleared: some Principles are established which may answer the Objections of the Jews and the Emperor Julian.*

pag. 46.

Chap. XXIII. *Of the Inspiration of the Books of the New Testament. A Refutation of the Opinion of Grotius and Spinosa. The Cardinal of Perron has given a very bad Exposition of the Words of the second Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, Chap. 3. v. 16. which makes mention of this Inspiration. The Disputes betwixt the Jesuits of Louvain and the Divines of the same place, upon this matter. Three Propositions of the Jesuits censured by the Doctors of Louvain and Douay. A Defence of those Propositions against the Censure of those Divines.*

pag. 59.

Chap.

The Contents.

Chap. XXIV. *An Examination of the Reasons that the Doctors of Louvain and Douay made use of in their Censure of the Propositions of the Jesuits of Louvain, touching the Inspiration of the Sacred Writings. A very free Opinion of a Learned Divine of Paris about the same thing.* pag. 71.

Chap. XXV. *Spinosa's Objections against the Inspiration of the Books of the New Testam. are examined.* pag. 80.

Chap. XXVI. *Of the Stile of the Evangelists and the Apostles. The Opinion of modern Writers, and of the ancient Doctors of the Church upon this matter; with many Critical Reflections.* pag. 84.

Chap. XXVII. *Of the Language of the Hellenists or Grecians; if that which bears that name be in effect a Language: The Reasons of Salmasius against that Language, do rather establish than destroy it. The Greek of the New Testament may be called the Greek of the Synagogue: the Jews Hellenists read in their Synagogues the Hebrew Text of the Bible, as well as the Jews.* pag. 94.

Chap. XXVIII. *A more particular Discussion of the Reasons alledged by Salmasius against the Language that is called Hellenistick. Several Difficulties also relating to this matter are cleared.* pag. 103.

Chap. XXIX. *Of the Manuscript Greek Copies in general, and of those who have spoken of them. Collections which*
B b *have.*

The Contents.

have been made of divers Readings drawn from those Manuscripts. Observations upon the whole matter. The Hereticks have been accused sometimes, but without any ground, for corrupting the Books of the New Testament. pag. 110.

Chap. XXX. *Of the Greek Copies of the New Testament in particular. The most ancient that we have at this day were written by the Latins, and were used by them. Those which were printed came from the Greek Churches. The ancient Latin Version which was in the Churches of the West before St. Jerom, were made by those first Copies which were not very correct. Of the ancient Cambridge Copy; why it does differ so much from other Greek Copies.* pag. 128.

Chap. XXXI. *Of the second part of the Cambridge Copy; which contains St. Paul's Epistles. Examples of the various Readings that are in that second Part. Critical Reflections upon the whole matter.* pag. 144.

Chap. XXXII. *Of other Greek Manuscript Copies of the New Testament. Examples of the various Readings of those Manuscripts; with Critical Reflections on those Differences.* pag. 156.

Chap. XXXIII. *Of the Order of the Greek Manuscript Copies of the New Testament. The Verses, Chapters, and other marks of distinction of those Copies. The Canons which Eusebius added to the Gospels; and the Use of those Canons.* pag. 175.

F I N I S.



